

25 CENTS

THE ARENA

THE WORLD'S LEADING REVIEW

Features of
This Number

THE RECOVERY OF JESUS FROM CHRISTIANITY

By
PROF. GEO. D. HERRON

A COLLEGE TRUST

By
PROF. THOS. E. WILL

JAMES A. HERNE: ACTOR, DRAMA- TIST, AND MAN

(SYMPOSIUM)

THE BILLION DOLLAR BUBBLE

By ROBERT A. WOOD

SEPTEMBER, 1901

THE RECOVERY OF JESUS FROM CHRISTIANITY

PROF. GEORGE D. HERRON
Late of Grinnell College, Iowa

A MENACE TO FREEDOM: THE COLLEGE TRUST

PROF. THOMAS E. WILL, A.M.
Of Ruskin College, Trondheim, Mo.

POLITICAL MOVEMENT OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

PROF. FRANK PARSONS, B.C.E., PH.D.
Of Boston University

WHEN WILL THE BUBBLE BURST? ROBERT A. WOOD

JAMES A. HERNE—ACTOR, DRAMATIST, AND MAN:

I. His Sincerity as a Playwright HAMLIN GARLAND

II. Mr. Herne as I Knew Him J. J. ENNEKING

III. The Man and His Work B. O. FLOWER

THE SINGLE TAX AS A HAPPY MEDIUM W. A. HAWLEY

LAW AND LIBERTY FRANK ELLINE

THE CRIMINAL NEGRO:

VII. Childhood Influences FRANCES A. KELLOR
Of the University of Chicago

TOPICS OF THE TIMES—(Editorial) B. O. FLOWER

The Successful Men of the Ages—Great Inventions of the Dawn-
ing Century and What they Promise for the Race—Mr. Johnson
and the Tax-dodging Corporations—Plutocracy's Belshazzar-like
Arrogance.

BOOKS OF THE DAY Studies and Reviews

"Labor;" Emilio Zola's Social Masterpiece—The Master-knot of
Human Fate—The Moriscos in Spain: Their Conversion and
Expulsion—The Woman Who Trusted—New Modes of Thought
—The Symphony of Life—The Life and Literature of the
Ancient Hebrews—Books Received.

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS J. E. M.

Vol. XXVI. No. 3. * * * * * Per Annum, \$2.50

569 FIFTH AVE. THE ALLIANCE PUBLISHING CO. NEW YORK

LONDON: Gay & Bird, 22 Bedford St., Strand,
MELBOURNE: G. G. Turri & Co., Salisbury Bldg.

Foreign Subscriptions,
Twelve Shillings

Nerve=Force



MRS. GEO. A. CORWIN.

is a Home Remedy; an UNGUENT for external application. It is founded upon the principle that Suffering, Premature Decline and Premature Death are the direct and indirect results of **DORMANT CIRCULATION**; that rescue can be assured only by its

re-establishment by directly charging the controlling Battery-cells with an element imitating the Nerve-force prepared for that purpose by Nature. This imitating element is our faithful NERVE-FORCE, and it will positively re-establish the most sluggish Circulation. It has won for us many Medals for Life-saving in the past eighteen years. We do not advertise it, however, but our NERVE-FORCE Journal. This Publication explains its every detail. We send it free, in plain envelope, to as many addresses as you may send us.

. . .

We appeal especially to the "chronically ill," who are wearied and discouraged with "stomach-dosing" as a means of warfare against Disease; to those threatened with cruel operations; to men and women who, in spite of heroic efforts for cure, feel themselves steadily declining; to men and women who are victims of either sedentary employment or excessive "Brain" exhaustion, and to those who have been cast aside as "incurable."

MR. AND MRS. GEO. A. CORWIN,

Bank Building,

Cor. Park Avenue and 125th Street,

New York City.

*"We do not take possession of our ideas, but are possessed by them.
They master us and force us into the arena,
Where, like gladiators, we must fight for them."*

—HEINE.

THE ARENA

VOL. XXVI.

SEPTEMBER, 1901.

No. 3.

THE RECOVERY OF JESUS FROM CHRISTIANITY.*

"What the Roman clients accomplished by fear, the priests of the feudal ages effected with the aid of religion, whereby they succeeded in so perverting the egoism of the laborers as to keep them from revolt. It is curious to note how such perversion was deduced, by means of a simple dialectic artifice, from the very morals that had previously inspired the demands of the rebellious slaves. Despite the fact that the greatest of all reformers denounced the furtive nature of property and the usurpatory character of wealth, both of which he excluded from the future life, his disciples hastened to draw a conservative deduction from this same doctrine. The inevitable exclusion of the rich from the kingdom of heaven, and the necessary triumph of the poor in the life to come, constituted, indeed, an excellent argument to reconcile the oppressed with the social system under which they groaned. Thus, under the evil influence of property, the very morality which for the moment enlightened the laborers on their true course became an efficient means of perverting their egoism and turning it from its proper path. Just as the Bible, in spite of its republican spirit, has so often been used in the defense of kings, so now the Gospels, despite their communistic tone, likewise become a powerful instrument for the protection of the richer classes when confided to the hands of mitered sophists who understand how to transform the greatest book of Socialism into the meanest defense of property.

"The inherent antithesis between the primitive and essentially revolutionary nature of Christian morals, and the quietive character derived therefrom through a malicious artifice, necessarily engendered pernicious digressions during the course of religious evolution, and introduced violent contradictions which often ended in bloody conflict."—*Professor Achille Loria, University of Padua, Italy.*

THE religion of Jesus came into the world as an appeal from authority to life. It was an elemental and inclusive revolt against priestly and governmental ordering of life by that which was external to itself. The revolt struck so deep that it was more than a revolt; it begot a radicalism of

* A lecture given in Central Music Hall, Chicago, Sunday afternoon, January 20, 1901.

soul that treated authority with a kind of divine contempt, and sometimes with a child-like loftiness of unconcern. The overflowing divinity and abundance of life, the open and unavoidable presence of the secret place of the Most High at every step or turn, the will to love in each man as his sole law and God—this was the faith of Jesus. To this faith the whole of life was the spirit of the Father, to whom every soul had free and instant access, to whom doors of love were always and everywhere open, so that every soul could go in and out and find pasture—go in and out and find truth and freedom for itself and for service. A divine anarchy of individual liberty for each soul, and a universal communism of spiritual and material goods for all souls, could be the only logic and outcome of such a faith. And it was equally logical that the entire output of Jesus' work and teaching should pile itself up in intrenchments of attack against institutional walls. To him these walls were the strength and symbol of the riot and lawlessness that were turning the garden of man into a wilderness of wild beasts, and wasting human life in every kind of discord and torment, tyranny and slavery. To a faith that took for its working basis the divinity of life, and that sought to awaken in each man the godhood that would make him a law unto himself, institutional authority could not be other than a lawless and atheistic setting at naught of fundamental being. Every coercive custom or law was a profane and deadly putting of hands on the only ark of the Lord that Jesus knew—the free individual. Authority over this free individual was an invasion and desecration of the holy of holies in which God dwelt. Mediatorial religious offices—assuming special privilege in God, presuming to dispense common spiritual property as the merchandise of private monopoly, asserting that only the God of the dead was trustworthy—were the essential atheism that darkened the world; they were the thick veil of subsidized unbelief that hid the real and glorious presence of the Father from the eyes of his sons and daughters.

No sooner had Jesus finished his work than the alchemy of authority began to surround and obscure his idea with the

atheistic principle that was its antithesis. The apostles did not understand Jesus, so he himself was always saying, nor his conception of the divinity of life, nor his matchless faith in liberty and free individuality. Even Paul, who so strenuously stood out against the apostles for his own liberty, could not be satisfied until he had forced the idea of Jesus into the mold of decadent philosophies that made life the evil to be overcome instead of the vision of God to be trusted and rejoiced in. The successors of the apostles, instead of seeking to uncover and call forth the free and divine individuality which Jesus saw in every man, began to impose an authoritative faith, guarded by priestly keys of heaven and hell, and at last enforced by the imperial legions of the Roman ruling or robber class. The innocent legends that naturally grew up about Jesus, in the mystery with which the atmosphere of the East always palpitates, were vested with official authority; and Jesus, the teacher and interpreter of life, became the ecclesiastical wonder-worker. The Christian way ceased to be the new and joyous mode of life it was in the sweet Christian spring-time. It lost that early spiritual fascination, that brave adventure of faith, that moral chivalry, that aspect of heroic quest which hurried men from land to land on winged feet and made the universe a romance to the soul. Instead it became a coercive and menacing faith—the enforced acceptance of the stoic theology and the decadent philosophy of a dying era; it became enforced under threat of loss of soul and wrath of God—the official tradition of the Church concerning Jesus' personality. And ever since, with certain heroic exceptions, historic Christianity has made its way by the atheistic force that put Jesus to death. It has wrought by the brute principle of authority, which is the negation of the free individuality that Jesus set forth as the sole reality of the universe. That which was atheism to Jesus became the orthodoxy of Christianity and the foundation upon which it built its faith and institutions. And the essentially atheistic organization of Christianity remains to this day, to darken the understanding of men and blind them with unfaith

in life, which is the supreme atheism and of which atheism Christianity is the supreme teacher.

The idea of Jesus was never wholly hid, for we find it breaking forth in the preaching of great fathers like Ambrose and Augustine; in beautiful apostles like Francis of Assisi and Bernard of Clairvaux; in the spiritual nobility and political vision of prophet-statesmen like Savonarola and Wyclif. It never ceased to work as a spiritual leaven, precipitating struggles for spiritual liberty and common property; and the Church always managed to turn these to its own glory and profit, after putting the strugglers to disgrace and death. But the Christ idea of the free and self-ruling individual never had free course; the "vested interests" of religious and economic systems alike kept it from being seen and glorified by the common life.

Now, all that I have said is consistent with an abiding faith in the divinity of history and in the sincerity of social evolution. The world being what it was when our era began, half slave and half barbaric, the idea of Jesus had to inclose itself in the historic form of Christianity in order to survive—in order to perpetuate itself down to a time when it could be understood and liberated as the organizing principle of life and society. The idea had to take divine risks, if it was to permeate and leaven and finally possess the world. It had to wear the paraphernalia of exhausted pagan religions; it had to steal along through the centuries under the cover and weight of the Roman imperial system; it had to bear the burden of false and monstrous theologies; it had to stain itself with the mean conflicts and base passions of parties and States; it had to have life and germinating power within itself during the long winter, and trust the human soil to give forth the free individuality of the kingdom of heaven at last. It could not have its way among men until it grew large and strong enough to make history after its own image; to take the reins of history in its own hands, and determine in advance the course of social evolution. It cannot yet use the systems and doctrines of the world for the expression of free individuality; for these have

been developed in historic experiences that have to do with master and man, king and subject, employer and workman; they have the color, the interests, and the feelings of a capitalistic world that is doomed to pass away.

But now the historic form of Christianity has done its appointed work and should be dismissed from the service of life. It is not Christian, either in its faith or its influence, and it ought to come to an end. It bears no resemblance to the simple religion and sweet faith of Jesus; and it does not believe in his self-governing idea, nor even know his gospel. Christianity is indeed a deadly unbelief in God in the name of God; a system of organized infidelity to Christ in the name of Christ. It is a vast parasitic tyranny, which can only exist by exhausting spiritual blood and nerve, by destroying vital faith, and by the utter prostitution of the soul. It is the product of the slave-centuries, with their slave habits of mind, and will not answer for a world in which the self-governing idea is about to make its first profound experiments. It is no fit religion for free men, and offers no fit expression for spiritual integrity or for the experiences of freedom.

If this needs emphasis we have only to reflect upon the prevailing attitude of the Church toward every great question that has to do with our common well-being. It is from the officials of the Church that the recent wars of greed and massacre have had their chief support. The English pulpit created and sustained the public opinion which the English government needed in order to commit one of the blackest crimes in the history of nations. It was from the American Church that the American government received its backing when it became the betrayer and assassin of the liberties of a confiding people. This same Church is urging this same movement upon a policy of blood and revenge in China, where the people have revolted at the wrongs visited upon them in the name of Christianity by its capitalistic and governmental employers. It is unthinkable that the distinctive religious and ruling class sees no inconsistency in bloodthirsty appeals for national retaliation and murder in the name of Christ; but such seems to be the case,

so complete is the spiritual prostitution which existing Christianity has wrought. And the infidelity of Christianity to Christ is further manifest in the almost unbroken opposition of the Church to the movement of labor for economic freedom; also to the further extension of the self-governing idea of Jesus in politics or society. Besides all this, when we reflect upon the character of so much of present-day preaching, upon its brutality and imbecility, upon its ignorance and servility, upon the frightful damage done to the souls of men by its moral ruffianism on the one side and its bloodless and degenerate piety on the other, upon the wolfishness of its ethics and the vulture-like character of its society, upon its support of all the fundamental immoralities of public life and industry, upon its resort to vulgar sensationalism and the methods of "yellow journalism" to get a hearing for pulpit trash, upon the great spiritual devastations which it calls revivals, upon the meanness and dishonesty of its councils—when we soberly and honestly think of what the pulpit really preaches and defends, we cannot but see that official Christianity subsists upon what is menacing to the soul's honesty; we cannot but see that it is destructive of brave faith, free individuality, and spiritual decency, as well as the chief obstacle to human emancipation. The practical atheism and destructiveness of the Christian system are manifest when its teachings and the fruits thereof are judged in the light of all that Jesus taught and meant to do. And this atheism is not mitigated by the noble army of martyrs whom the Church has put to death and then glorified on her banners; nor by the millions of pure and loving individuals who take part in its institutions and activities.

Human life is to-day far better than its preaching; more truly spiritual than its professed religions; nobler than its covenants. It is the real religious nature of the people that is turning them from the Church; and their revolt against the Church's religious system is due to an instinctive and unconscious turning to Christ. The world-movement toward wholeness of liberty is beginning to demand a synthesis of life that shall furnish it with a working basis of bold and adventurous

faith. The long winter is breaking—the winter through which the seed of Judas has lain in the human soil—and a new spring-time of faith is calling us. By this faith will come the recovery of Jesus from Christianity. And the Socialist movement has come into the kingdom of man for just such a time. Socialism will reject Christianity, as it ought to reject it; but it will liberate the spirit and idea of Jesus, and give unto him a sympathy and understanding which an infidel Church has so long denied him. Upon the foundation of economic freedom and unity which Socialism shall lay will the idea of Jesus disclose itself, and have its first fair and free hearing among men.

But if we follow the attitude of Jesus toward life, there is much we have thought sacred and essential that will have to be left behind; much that is not good now, however good it may once have been. The fragmentary records that we call the Gospels have come down to us through the bitter strifes and vicissitudes of parties and sects. They have been subject to changes from language to language, and from changes at the hands of dominant interests. There are things in these Gospels which we do not know about; things which are interpolations or mutilations; things which Jesus probably did not say or do; things which, if he did say them, were mistaken or non-essential applications of his own idea, due to the color and heritage of his times. Then the theological form in which we have known Jesus so mars and distorts his features, so wholly misrepresents his idea and initiative, that we have to go behind the theological centuries in order to see who he really was.

Yet we are left neither desolate nor doubtful, if with brave and truthful eyes we read the matchless life-story which these Gospels artlessly tell, and which neither the misunderstandings of the writers nor the blemishes of priestly scribes can unteach. There is left to us, for adoration and for faith, the sweetly masterful Man, serenely poised amidst the fiercest and hatefulest strifes of men and parties, harnessing the mightiest passions and most consuming affections of his soul to the chariot of an ideal which centuries to come will rejoice in, and centuries beyond

them light the world by. Limitless reserve power, a strength that is all-loving while yet so powerful as to be unconscious of itself or of effort, a tenderness that is majestic, a spiritual vision that takes human infinitude into its perspective—and all these as the blossom of our common human experience, the outgrowth of our human flesh and blood—this is what we see when we look at him who spake the common spiritual sense of the world as never man spake it. We do not see him when we look on the hideous figure of theology and medieval art; the crushed spirit, the broken and mutilated life, the calculated action, the legal obedience—these are not the mighty and beautiful child-man of Galilee. We may better see him in the Prometheus of the sorely needed gospel of Æschylus, defying gods and governments, their heavens and their hells, in order that he may steal the fire of love for the light and warmth of starved and fear-driven men. Or we may see him in the divine revelation of man which comes to us in the Hermes of Praxiteles—the most perfect expression of spiritual manhood that art has ever made. We cannot find him in the slave-preaching of slave-obedience from the pulpits of authority; but we may find him in the heroic love and labor of the common life, from which he sprang and whose glory he is.

It was an unusual power to see the elemental and enduring truth about life, and urgently to interpret life and destiny in the terms of that truth, that made Jesus the most anointed and beloved of the sons of men. He got at the living principle that works at the roots of things, and that runs through their coarse experiences to their blossom and goal. He precipitated into such living crystals the truths at which Moses and the ancients had toiled, and flashed the light of them into so far a future that we are only just now beginning dimly to see what he meant and to think seriously of looking at our life and society in that light. There was much that he did not see and much that he did not do, but no statement or reorganization of life can henceforth get on without his truth. Any new synthesis of life will have to take Jesus into account in a very fundamental way. Stripped of legend and ecclesiastical authority,

the truth he saw will be the unifying principle of the synthesis that will liberate the love-energy by which the whole of life is to be set free.

Thus we are not left orphaned or comfortless, as we turn from the Christ of the past to follow the Christ of the future. We are rather set free clearly to see, for the first time, the fatherhood and brotherhood which Jesus brought to light. It is the obscuring shadows cast by theology and politics on his way, and not the Christ, that we leave behind; we leave only that which prevented us from seeing him as he is. There is left to us that which the official faiths could not give, and which they cannot take away—an ever-persistent will to love, a world-making idea, a glorified thought of man, a spirit and attitude toward life that are above all authority. And these are breaking upon us to-day as our new heaven of truth, in the light of which we may rise to build the new earth of love and liberty.

But we are not to give a new arbitrary authority to Jesus, by holding him responsible for our interpretation of his idea; we are to seek to establish connections between that idea and life and society—living connections—that will enable the idea to reinterpret itself in every fresh problem and experience. It is not a name we are to follow, but the love-way of life and truth. There is a sense in which Jesus will have to be forgotten, in order that his truth may be remembered. He will have to throw his name away, in order to breathe into us his spirit of infinite daring; he will have to pass through our doubts, in order to lead us to his faith in life; he will have to cease to be an authority, in order to become our teacher; he will have to lose himself, in order to save us with his idea; he will have to forget his cross, and make no claims because of it in order to become our brother. The worship of Jesus the person must be changed into a worship of the Christ-principle in humanity; changed to a working with his will to love in the common life. Our personal devotion to him must grow into a social joy, a democratic exaltation of spirit, a service of praise

expressed in calling the average man to godlike sacrifice in upholding the invisible pillars of a heroic public life.

It is not Jesus we need to follow, but the Lord of love and truth in our own souls. We ought not to want to be like Jesus; we ought to be like the thought which God has for each of us, and which he whispers when we are still, or perhaps when we are in the thick of labor or of battle. We have the same right that he had, and are under the same divine compulsion that he was—each to realize our full and free individuality. We are as near the heart of fundamental Being, as deep in the secret of the Most High, as he was; and we are at fault if we do not express that secret more openly, and that being more modernly. It would be wrong in us to limit our own time and experiences to the limitations and experiences of his time. We are most truly his friends, his brothers and lovers, his disciples and saved ones, when we claim and keep for ourselves the freedom which he claimed and kept for himself—kept unto the end, and out into the endless. For myself, I could never desire with Paul to be his slave, or consent to be chained to his chariot; for I am sure that this is the one thing which he himself would never desire or consent to. It is as a friend and equal that he calls me to his fellowship. Only as I will be a slave to no man, or to no God, can I bear the judgment-gaze of Christ and walk before men with his meekness and lowliness of heart. By this appeal from his authority to the divine presence which he disclosed in my own soul, I can be most distinctly loyal to the faith which the great Lord of love asked of men.

You can thus see that loyalty to the idea of Jesus means the end of official religion. To a faith which is truly Christian, there can be no authoritative Church; no temple in the kingdom of heaven for which such a faith looks and works. The faith of Jesus in the divinity of life is the polar opposite of submission to religious authority, which rests upon the denial of God in life. By no possibility could an authoritative Church honestly bear Jesus' name, no matter how many and good its works, any more than an absolute monarchy could be democratic by being benevolent; for, just as the monarchy rests upon

a despotic principle, so the Church rests upon a principle that is fundamentally atheistic. The denial that God is in life and that life is in God, the imposing upon man of an institution to mediate between God and himself, the building up of a ruling spiritual class to dictate terms of admission to God's presence, the training of the soul in a crawling servility of attitude, the establishing of religion on the basis of barter and exchange between God as an infinite capitalist and man as a submissive worker for heavenly wages—all this is the precise atheism which the faith of Jesus came to destroy. It is the horrid blasphemy and outrage which shook the being of Jesus with a blended indignation and sympathy that seem to have sometimes almost torn up his life by the roots. Yet this blasphemy and outrage are the foundation upon which historic Christianity has built. And they are the only foundation there is for an official religion to build upon. Let the faith of Jesus once possess the common life, and his idea of free individuality awaken men to the knowledge of who and what they are, and there is not left for the Church even the shadow of a foundation.

Nor could there be an authoritative Church in a truly democratic society; for, in the nature of the case, a church is a spiritual aristocracy. Economic democracy means spiritual democracy; and to either of these an official religion is a philosophic antithesis, to put it on a baldly intellectual ground. The assumption of a ruling spiritual class is the stuff out of which the Church is built. It rests upon the assumption of special privilege and class-property in God; upon the assumption that some people have more of God than other people, and that they are thereby authorized to sell the knowledge of God for institutional profit. This is not only undemocratic and anti-social: it is the devouring spirit of the Antichrist, abroad in the world in the name of Christ, destroying faith in the name of faith and hiding God from society in the name of God. It is not strange that the Church has invariably sided with the ruling class; for it is itself an inherently ruling-class organization. The Church is also perfectly consistent when it dreads

and opposes the rise of Socialism; for there could no more be an official religion in the coöperative commonwealth than there could be midnight at noonday. Let the idea of an economic ruling class once break down, and every other kind of ruling-class idea breaks down with it. The oil monopoly, permitting the people to have oil only on its own terms, is operated by precisely the same spiritual principle by which the Church operates when it dispenses what it calls salvation on its own terms. The monopoly and the Church grow on the same spiritual root, and you cannot pull up one without pulling up the other; or, rather, you cannot communize the oil supply without communizing the world's truth supply. Capitalism and official religion are one and the same thing at bottom, each springing from the same violently atheistic principle; and when the industrial priest goes the religious priest will go along with him. A society organized by the self-governing idea of Jesus, and founded upon his elemental faith in life, can have no possible use for either priest or capitalist. The coöperative commonwealth means that the whole common life shall be seen as the vision of God, in the splendid light of which the nations shall walk, and every individual. The coming of democratic Socialism is the preparation of the way for the aftercoming of the holy church of humanity, in which every soul shall be a high and free apostle of truth. Freedom will generate its own religion; and that religion will be the great common life becoming priestless and God-conscious, as Jesus meant it to be.

Perhaps it ought to be said, out of justice to the Catholic Church, that there are historic reasons which make possible its perpetuation along the lines of manifest economic development. I can quite agree that the Roman Church has within itself the germ of a universal spiritual democracy, the outlines of a world-society. It is certainly not a sect, and it has always been universal in its ideals of society. The golden age of labor, which the economist tells about, was in part due to its patronage and protection. However corrupt or tyrannical its conduct and administration, it has never quite ceased to be

democratic somewhere in its organism, and its sympathies have never wholly forsaken the people. If the Pope holds out long enough he may yet become the true father of a universal democracy, and the pastor and coördinator of States. If the Catholic Church knew how to lose itself, it might speak the unifying word that would undo the capitalistic order and prepare the Socialist highway for the coming of the kingdom of heaven. If I believed in the principle of authority at all, I should certainly seek rest within its bosom; and I should seek to raise new altars of that marvelous devotion to the person of Christ, that spiritual passion and chivalry, which flamed forth in the divine knighthood of Saint Francis and Saint Bernard. But I believe that the principle of authority is not Christian, but atheistic; and I see no hope that the Catholic Church will speak the unifying and liberating word to society. Besides, it would be fatal to the coöperative commonwealth if the Socialist movement that brings it should proceed under the patronage of any kind of a church, or depend upon any other than its own initiative. Socialism must give no hostages save its pledge of free individuality to the laborer and the people.

So far as Protestantism is concerned, it no longer stands for reality. Its church-goings and activities are without spontaneity or vital spirituality. Its so-called services have become a superstition that is just as persistent, though slightly more refined, as the superstition that bends the savage soul to gods of wood and stone, or the painted ox and the sacred crocodile. Protestantism is a performance, and no longer a faith; it rests upon unfaith and fear, or upon unthinking obligation and stupid habit. The daring initiative from which it sprang, the Prometheus-like spirit of the first reformers, will have to be looked for outside of the Church—among men and efforts that refuse Christ's name. The principle of spiritual adventure that begot the Protestant revolt is the principle that will destroy it; for Protestantism has driven the principle of its being from its councils, and all brave faith with it. The faith of Jesus will soon lift up its voice within church walls no more, but it will take to the fields and the mobs, and be heard in the city

street and along the dusty highway, in Socialist political meetings and barren public halls.

Even so, let Jesus quickly come; for the spiritual revolt against authority is a glad sign of the recovery of his spirit from Christianity. It is the coming again of the Son of man—this time to find the faith he wants for brave and fruitful social adventure. It heralds the time when naked Truth will be its own authority, and need not be clothed upon by priests or enforced by institutions or constitutions. Whoever then has what he thinks to be a word of God or common good to speak will have to depend upon the worth and divine attractive power of what he is and says. Truth that is really true needs no authority to back it up. Authority is the millstone around truth's neck. And we need not fear that what ought to be heard will ever go unheard in the free society. For the common life yearns and agonizes for truth. It has never been the people who have rejected or crucified the truth, except when driven by fear or ignorance or force to follow ruling-class leaders. With the passing away of authority, truth will for the first time have a free vision, a free hearing, and a free human soil to take root and bear fruit in. And when we have the faith of Jesus to depend upon, unbound and unguarded truth to make us free, then we shall be free indeed; for we shall have entered into the faith that is nothing else than freedom.

And the truth that makes free will banish fear from human motivity. Fear has never been anything but a slave-motive in life or religion; it has never answered for free men. The great spiritual adventurers, who by daring risk and initiative have brought truth and liberty to light, have had to leave all fear behind. There is indeed nothing in the universe to be afraid of, save the fearing that keeps us from being love-true and free. When we are done with fearing anything known or unknown, and learn to trust life as its own law and keeper, we shall as consciously have our being in God as we have our breathing in the air. We shall then know that we and the Father are one—that human life and history are but a mode

of the fundamental being or spirit which Jesus called Father. In the secret places of our deepest and most high experiences, we shall see that a universal will to love is the heart and whole of things, and that we ourselves are the struggle of that will for self-realization and freedom. And when at last we have the faith to brave the flaming sword that guards the gates of paradise, we shall find that it has been harmless to hurt us all along, and shall find it turned to ashes as we enter the gates, to go no more out forever.

The recovered idea of Jesus will again lead us, as it did in the beginning, in a revolt against human helplessness. Historic Christianity has been so largely the religion of a mutilated life, of helpless submission to monstrous wrong and organized lies, on the ground of remote heavenly recompense, that we have lost sight of that affirmation of human omnipotence and wholeness which was the power of the initiative of Jesus. The Church, it is true, has brought down to modern life the light of the world; but it has brought it inclosed in all the thick darkness of Asia. It has taught as Christian truth the dark dualistic philosophy that made life an evil. It wrought its atheistic doctrines of life in the blood and brain of civilization. But Jesus identified life with God, and filled it with the song of birds, and the blooming of flowers, and the happy smile of children, and the truth and innocence of love. The Church has set forth unhappiness and resignation as the primal elements of virtue and piety, and made happiness the dreadful sin to be overcome by the elect; but Jesus set forth the law of a happiness that carried in itself the eager serenity and confident gladness of the higher Greek faiths—Apollo being a better prophet of the Christ than either Elijah or Calvin. The Church has begotten a servile morality that is now chiefly protected by the want of courage and spiritual energy to live one's own life, and that satisfies its fears and hypocrisy by propitiating the established and the unknown; but Jesus, the truest and sweetest pagan as well as the Christ-man, calling men afresh to the joy of Nature and to communion with her spirit, begot a life that transcends all moral systems, that goes

beyond our good and evil, and that knows no part of man as higher or lower than any other part, but sees only the transfiguring divinity of the whole. The Church has trained the soul to the slave-spirituality of submission to brute force in the form of political and religious authority; but Jesus trained the soul for free and unmenaced individuality—for a love of liberty so strong that it was counted sweetest gain to die a free man rather than live as any kind of a slave. The Church being built upon the principle of authority in both law and doctrine, its whole self-interest has lain in keeping men in fear and subjection; in destroying that spiritual adventure which is the sole certificate and expression of faith. The religion of Jesus enthroned man as a god and creator in the universe, brought forth to test and try its resources and processes, to select what is good as the means and ways of free and almighty human living, and thus to make a universe according to his divine liking.

That the recovered idea of Jesus will call forth a faith and action that shall match it, we need not doubt. It is moving amidst our confusion and public apathy, our degrading commercial and Kiplingian literature, our brutal and cowardly Rooseveltian ethics, our shameful honors based on ability to steal and kill, our industrial survivals of predatory savage instincts, to find the spiritual heroism that lies somewhere at the source of it all and summon it to the service of the higher Socialist ideal. It will find what it seeks—a spiritualized and socialized heroism of the common life—and lead it to camp-fire and field of the divine battle that cannot end, until the gates of heaven are taken by man at last, and set in the walls of the holy communist commonwealth. Then shall the will to love in the midst of life be the shepherd of all peoples, and guide them unto fountains of living waters, where God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes.

The faith toward human life which Jesus held, we also may hold, and look and work for the perfect manifestation of its divinity. The human life that has stood the shocks and treasons of history, that has survived the bonds and stripes of

its institutional keepers, that has dreamed the love-dreams of democracy and Socialism, that has brought forth Jesus from its own flesh and blood and the French Revolution from its spiritual majesty, that has rocked the Christ-ideal in the cradle of its hopes, and watched it grow to threaten the world with its glory—that human life is to be trusted. The highest thought of it which man has ever held is but a hint of what is already accomplished for it at the infinite heart of things. For our human life is God's perfect thought—the word which was with God in the beginning, and which will at last be perfectly spoken by a strifeless progress and a joyous history.

Have I taken away your Lord by setting forth the truth upon which he stood rather than the names which the Church has given him? Have I despoiled your faith by asking you to follow his idea of the free and self-governing individual, ensphered in a coöperative and communistic society, rather than the quality of salvation to which the Church invites you? It does not seem to me so. If I have stripped Jesus of his theological attributes, of an unreal and immoral perfection, of power to save with a fictitious and destructive salvation, I have brought him to his own in the human life which begot him and whose divinity he manifests. I have put him into the thick of the human struggle from which an infidel Church withholds him, and where a tender chivalry of strong devotion will crown him with a glory and honor that no official religion has ever given him. I have enshrined him in the faith that is to make the free and universal society, and enthroned him in the heart of the history that moves our human life toward the certain victory of the will to love.

As a child, I used to wonder, as every one sooner or later does, how the great God could have peace in his heart and yet behold the suffering and torment of the world. I felt sure that if I were God my heart would break, and my mind let go of itself, so that the universe would fall back into the chaos and nothingness from which I supposed it had come. If I could not sleep, nor eat my food, because of the misery and slavery of the world, how could God stand it, and besides have in his

heart the peace which Jesus and Paul invoked as a benediction? After years of brooding I saw that only love could have peace—an unfathomable and inexhaustible love that could lay itself down under the whole human situation and fling itself over the whole human retrospect and prospect, so that it should become a sort of infinite heart-inclosure of the whole human experience, bearing just what human life bore, feeling just what it felt, having only what it had, waiting as long as it must wait, finding liberty only when it should become free. I saw how love could have peace by loving all that was not love until it should become love; how the universe could tolerate itself only by bringing forth the best that was in it and putting that best at the service of the worst, or of what has not yet become the best.

As I felt this necessity which lay at the infinite heart of things, and thought upon it, I found it one day taking the form and features of the Christ—first the Christ-man, and afterward the Christ-society. I saw how needful to itself it was that the universe should bring out of its heart some such humanity as was idealized in Jesus; how needful to man it was that he should have some such evidence of love, some such word of universal mind, in order to take the universe seriously and lovingly and believe it to be sincere and rational. Since then, and more than ever to-day, through every development of thought or change of faith or shifting of emphasis, it has been by fellowship with the heart of Jesus, and by seeing his mind as the light that moves on my path when I move, that I have been able to interpret life or live it; able to think of anything as fundamental; able to make any sense out of the universe; able to find any reason for the being of anything. Making full allowances for the child-like and natural exaggerations of his life by his disciples, for their naïve and unconscious concealment of his perplexities and faults, for mistaken thoughts which he may have held in common with his time, for deformities inflicted upon his truth by authority, we may still say that man never spake as this man. He spoke the most liberating and world-making word that has ever fallen from human lips.

No such light as his has shone upon life's fateful problems. His is the strongest and loveliest figure that has come to be our symbol and prophecy. He is the noblest and worthiest shrine at which human life has knelt. That it may continue to kneel there, until it shall be changed into all that was strong and lovely in his likeness, until it shall live out all that was true and beautiful in his teachings, is the best prayer I can make for humanity, or to it.

Yet Jesus cannot solve the problem of economic and social freedom. He is not equal to the Socialist revolution. We shall love him and understand him, and he will abide with us; but it will be by other forces than his that the free age will be brought in. The work that now lies before man must be done in the name of man, and the common life of the working class must become the world's new savior.

GEORGE D. HERRON.

New York.

A MENACE TO FREEDOM: THE COLLEGE TRUST.

THAT the triumph of plutocracy must precede that of the people now seems clear. The unification of our industries in the hands of a few great magnates, kings of commerce and over-lords of trade, is almost here. The accepted list of trusts is in itself a verification of the forecasts of Marx and Engels as striking as the appearance, on schedule time, of a predicted eclipse. And the work proceeds apace. Forty years of financial legislation has almost finished the task of centering completely in the hands of a few monopolists, with Rockefeller and Morgan at their head, the control of the circulatory system of the body politic. New York City is the financial heart of the nation. It is stated by an observant Wall street reader that such is the "fearful power exerted by the house of J. P. Morgan & Co." that, "with at most three others," it "can damn any financial project brought to" our commercial metropolis. Henry Clews, weathervane of Wall street, tells us that with these interests "manipulation has ceased to be speculation. Their resources are so vast that they need only to concentrate on any given property in order to do with it what they please;" that "they are the greatest operators the world has ever seen," and that "this combination controls Wall street almost absolutely."

Of the recent mighty movement in railway circles the public is aware. That it looks toward the perfection of a national railroad trust who can doubt? Furthermore, with it comes the concentration of coal companies and steel companies. Of this Mr. Morgan's partner, Mr. Robert Bacon, declares: "When this combination is completed, J. P. Morgan will be the absolute head of it all." The taking over of the express companies by the same interests is also foreshadowed, to be followed by the taking over perhaps of all the other trusts.

So ominous has grown the outlook that some Republican editors stand aghast at the speedy consummation of policies for which they worked and voted last November, and indulge in declarations which, coming from other sources, they would until recently have branded as insane and incendiary. Of the "Railroad Trust" one of these men declares: "The nation will take it, either at a reasonable compensation or simply by confiscation, through mandate of the people that will set aside even the Supreme Court." And another: "The people will stand this for a less or greater time, as may be, and then the revolution will come."

From such talk, wild though it sounds, we may well take courage and inquire, Will even the party lash, with gratitude for favors received and hope of benefits to come, permanently suffice to hold in line the army who by their ballots have given to plutocracy a *carte blanche* for four years more of license and loot?

That private monopoly spells public monopoly, and that the coming issue is Rockefeller and Morgan *versus* Uncle Sam, is evident. But we must not solace ourselves with the belief that the transfer of the coming single great trust from private hands to all the people will be easily effected. Other nations, notably Rome, have reached the stage of huge private monopolies, but no nation has ever yet taken the step proposed. Alexander Del Mar points out that in Rome the private monopolies fell in a single day, absorbed by a single, all-inclusive, public monopoly. But of this the Emperor was head. Such a solution is no solution. The one great trust must be operated by all in the interest of all.

The men who own and administer our industries may not lightly be set aside. They will not be caught napping. Controlling talents equaling those of Cæsar, Gregory the Great, Machiavelli, Napoleon, and Bismarck, they cannot be routed, with ballots or bullets, by an undisciplined mob spurred on by the consciousness of empty dinner-pails. For years the plutocracy have been preparing for the coming conflict. Otherwise, why the Napoleonic revival? Why the bastiles of death

looming grimly in all our great cities? Why the recent vast expenditures for a navy? Why the steady pressure for a large and permanent increase in our standing army; and why the recent parade of the Rough Rider and his cohorts?

But more insidious and dangerous still are the attempts to debauch the public conscience with schemes of conquest and plunder and to blind the people to the development actually in progress and to its inevitable effects. To this end the organs of intelligence must be controlled. Most of the great dailies and magazines have been captured. How news is systematically "doctored" or suppressed by the Associated Press monopoly, such men as Congressman John J. Lentz have told us. Rumors of the coming newspaper trust are in the air. Government censorship of press despatches seems to have become an established institution, and an American editor has been deported, without trial, from the Philippines, not for publishing falsehood but for criticizing a custom-house official and thus becoming "a menace to the military situation." A back-slidden church has become plutocracy's right arm, and again, as in the days of Jeremiah, "the prophets prophesy falsely and the priests bear rule by their means," and too many of "the people love to have it so."

The most dangerous enemy to industrial monarchy is our educational system, especially our colleges and universities. During one's college days, if ever, one's mind is free. Light, truth, and progress are the traditional watchwords of colleges throughout Christendom. Here, if nowhere else, the business in hand is to enlarge the intelligence, quicken the conscience, purify the ideals, and consecrate the life to the noblest ends. Further, the study of history, politics, economics, and sociology has become the vogue, and courses even in Socialism are regularly given. More important, the laboratory method of study has been introduced by the departments of natural science. Research has become a regular feature of the work of advanced students and each is taught that to be scientific he must lay aside prejudice, think lightly of author-

ity, go to the bottom of things, and then without fear or favor tell what he has found.

Such methods are revolutionary, and wherever conscientiously applied, as in the biological field, have resulted in throwing the science of our fathers into the waste-basket. But competition exists in our universities, each department seeking to appear the most highly scientific, publish the most notable papers, and attract the brightest minds. This competition the economic and sociologic departments must meet, and, to do so successfully, must accept (nominally) the standards that dominate the natural science departments. Advanced students must be set to investigating all manner of social and economic problems and be told that the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth is this Holy Grail. For, to circumscribe the field of investigation or suggest in advance what the investigator must discover would result in laughing the department off the campus.

Free investigation is all that is necessary to expose the rotteness of the existing economic system, and in every university there are students willing and able to turn on the search-light. In many universities, furthermore, there are some teachers of the social sciences who would be glad to be true to university ideals and make of their departments centers of light. But, with an arrogance equaling that of the slave power, our plutocracy has issued its edict that the colleges and universities must fall into line. Hence the inevitable conflict.

Dr. Andrew D. White has traced the "warfare of science with theology." One who has read his book can understand the present warfare of science with wealth.

To control higher education American wealth-owners may do one of three things: First, they may build their own schools, colleges, and universities. Examples are the institutions constructed by the "liberality" of the Vanderbilts, Armours, Stanfords, Rockefellers, etc. In such institutions it is essential constantly to proclaim that the widest liberty of teaching is encouraged and that the sole object of investigation is the truth and the truth only. To permit the impression to go

out that the teachers were interested or gagged and the jury packed would hopelessly discredit the institution and destroy its influence, thus defeating the object of its existence. Second, our ruling class may look with compassionate eye upon the swarm of little, struggling, starveling colleges with which our land is sown and minister to their distress. Manifestly such institutions may be expected to possess sufficient gratitude and business sense to refrain from biting the hand that feeds them. Third, they must control the State educational institutions. Public colleges and universities have from the first been objects of dread to the enemies of our popular liberties: hence the defeat, to this day, of the National University project, though indorsed by Washington and Jefferson and supported by an overwhelming weight of fact and argument; hence also the subversion of Harvard from a State to a semi-private institution, the defeat of other State college efforts in the East, and the practical triumph in that section of the private college and university principle.

The people's colleges and universities may at times pass into the control of the people's friends, and the tremendous enginery represented by these institutions be wrested from the grip of those who make of it a commercial asset and be employed in the interest of the people themselves. A few such instances have occurred, and the fury of the dispossessed and their masters, incredible otherwise, can be understood only by those who appreciate the potency of light and the direct bearing of higher educational institutions upon the problem of "social control."

In the State educational institutions the policy of the proprietary class is to secure control, place in charge only "safe men," *i.e.*, men in sympathy with private wealth or afraid to voice other views, employ professors who have been educated in "safe" institutions and come with the indorsement of those institutions, inculcate their views as "scientific" and scout all contrary opinions as "unscientific" and "partizan," use text-books, if any, that are also "scientific" in the same sense (though these text-books are at times grossly partizan

and false), insist that their representatives must permanently continue in control whatever may be the vicissitudes of State politics, any other policy being gross "spoilsism," and terrorize into silence and submission all teachers whose views may not square with their own.

With Jesuitical adroitness this policy has been pursued, until, with rare exceptions, the higher educational institutions of America have been silenced or enlisted in the service of wealth, the natural opponents of this policy continuing for the most part ignorant of it or indifferent and apathetic, weakly accepting as "scientific" or "partizan" whatever was so labeled by the controlling interests and raising no hand to rescue their colleges from this pitiful thralldom.

The situation, meanwhile, for the teacher of the social sciences has become grave. On one hand he sees position, assured income, "scientific" standing, promotion, and opportunity to work undisturbed in his chosen field. On the other he sees discharge, disgrace, proscription, the stigma of "unprofessionalism" and "partizanship," and—the black-list; for in offending privilege and wealth he has roused a foe that never forgives or forgets, a demon that never sleeps.

Is it conceded that college teaching on social lines in America is not free? Yes and no. The positions taken by defenders of academic prostitution are directly contradictory. One who reads them is forcibly reminded of the logic of the old lady accused of breaking a borrowed kettle. Her defense was that the kettle was broken when she got it, sound when she returned it, and that she never had it.

The defenders of college proscription offer a twofold defense. It is, first, that college professors and presidents are unhampered—free as the wind that blows and the birds that fly—and, second, that of course they are not free; that they have no right to be; that they are but hirelings doing the bidding of their employers, attorneys defending the case of their clients, magnets to draw patronage and money to their respective colleges. Free and bound, judges and attorneys, impartial and disinterested devotees of truth and exponents

of doctrines and policies that will attract the wealth of the wealthy—such, we are told, is the paradoxical position of college men who assume to deal with living issues.

Such statements require support. Here it is:

First: "College men are free." Few data are here needed. The colleges have all along professed freedom. To suggest its absence has been regarded an insult as gross as is a reflection upon the incorruptibility of a juror or judge or the virtue of a woman. Harvard's constant boast, true of some departments, is that that institution is the home of freedom, a genuine "republic of letters." Chicago University in the throes of the Bemis controversy indignantly repelled the charge that the removal of Prof. Bemis was due in the remotest degree to his economic views or to Mr. Rockefeller's wealth or wishes. Said Professors Small and Butler, in presenting the University side: "We wish to make the most emphatic and unreserved assertion which words can convey that the 'freedom of teaching' has never been involved in the case." President Harper added, "There is not an institution of learning in the country in which freedom of teaching is more absolutely untrammelled than in the University of Chicago;" while the congregation of the same institution on June 30, 1899, solemnly resolved: "That the principle of complete freedom of speech on all subjects has from the beginning been regarded as fundamental in the University of Chicago. . . . That this principle can neither now nor at any future time be called in question." Leland Stanford University has made its especial boast of freedom and loyalty to truth for truth's sake. Says a writer: "Leland Stanford University has long made it a boast that it cherished especially a spirit of freedom and liberality within the proper limitations of each professor's sphere in the class and lecture room. Alumni of the institution have fondly referred to this tradition as 'the Stanford spirit.'"

The Chicago *Evening Post* for June 16, 1900, said: "Professor Will did not hesitate to assert that college teaching was being 'subjugated' to the interests of wealth and privilege;

that with rare exceptions presidents and instructors in the United States 'are not free to write, speak, or teach on public questions except in harmony with the powers that be,' and that science is tending to become a farce in our educational institutions. That there is a scintilla of valid evidence in support of this startling charge may be emphatically denied. . . . The utmost freedom of teaching, opinion, and speech prevails [in our leading colleges]. There are no 'official' doctrines which the professors are required to promulgate."

That any should dare to take the other horn of the dilemma seems incredible; yet pages might be filled with admissions and positive declarations to this effect. A few must suffice. The most numerous and brazen occurred in connection with the Andrews case:

"The trustees have the unquestionable right to suppress teaching which they believe to be false as well as injurious to the college." (Penn Yan, N. Y., *Express*, July 28, 1897.) Neither president nor professors "can deny the right of any congregation to select the kind of doctrine that it would like its youth to be taught." (New York *Mail and Express*, August 3, 1897.) "When a professor attempts to teach free-silverism in a gold-bug college, why should he not be turned out if he lacks the grace voluntarily to resign?" (*Minneapolis Times*, July 28, 1897.) "This was not a blow at free speech, but a recognition of the absurdity of a free-silver champion drawing a salary from a sound-money corporation for teaching the students that which the supporters of the university condemned as pernicious and dangerous." (New York *Mail and Express*, Sept. 15, 1897.) The issue was "Andrews or a million dollars, and no man is worth a million dollars to a college; therefore, Andrews must go." (A New England college president to the writer.) "The trustees had indeed a right to expect him to shape his teachings in economics to meet their views." (The Philadelphia *Commonwealth*, July 31, 1897.) "He was only a servant; and a servant must do as his employers wish, or quit their service." (St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, July 30, 1897.) If a college president or professor

"must be permitted to teach errors, the quicker the fact is known the better. Theological seminaries do not allow such latitude." (*Utica Herald*, August, 1897.) "The final test of a college president is his ability to draw funds toward the institution over which he presides." (*Maryland Democrat*, July 3, 1897.) "It was simply a business proposition." (*Kansas City Star*, July 28, 1897.) "If he had persisted in the public expression of his obnoxious opinions, and had not offered his resignation, it would have been their duty to dismiss him." (*Poughkeepsie Eagle*, July 29, 1897.) "The prime objection to him as president . . . was because he taught principles of politics that conflicted seriously with the prevailing belief and sentiment of the university and of the community with which it is identified." (*New York Sun*, August 6, 1897.) "There can be no doubt that an advocate of the unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 is not a valuable president for an Eastern college, which must in the nature of things depend upon the support of men who believe in the maintenance of the gold standard." (*New York Critic*, July 31, 1897.) "The trustees, . . . when they find a president or a professor teaching pernicious doctrines, . . . ought to discharge him and put in his place an orthodox teacher; if the issue should be raised between business men who support colleges and professors who live upon them, the latter will find their occupation gone." (*Philadelphia Ledger*, August 5, 1897.)

"But," it may be objected, "these are but irresponsible newspaper utterances. What is the position of university authorities?"

Mr. James Henry Raymond, A.M., LL.B., a trustee of Northwestern University, in a signed and published statement said: "In social science and political science they [professors], as a rule, are only a little less qualified to be the final arbiters as to what shall be taught than they are concerning financial problems, and, I repeat, in all things they should promptly and gracefully submit to the final determination of the trustees. . . . A professor is not a mere parrot to repeat and fairly

explain to his students the diametrically opposite premises, arguments, and conclusions of the writers and teachers of the ages upon any given subject. He must of necessity be an advocate, but his advocacy must be in harmony with the conclusions of the powers that be, with the animus and main purposes of the institution, and the teachings of his co-laborers."

That this expression was not unrepresentative is shown by the following declaration by Mr. Raymond: "During the week that has elapsed since its publication I have not received any criticism from university circles, but I have received from the most unexpected sources the most unqualified commendation. . . . The commendations that I refer to come not only from officers of our University but also from those connected with other institutions who have given this matter long and careful study."

Following the above, interviews were had with representatives of Northwestern, Cornell, Columbia, Yale, Princeton, Chicago, Johns Hopkins, and the American, to whom were shown Mr. Raymond's statements. These gentlemen were almost unanimous in their agreement with Mr. Raymond. In answer to the question, "Who is to decide whether the teaching of a professor is truth or untruth?" a Columbia trustee replied, "The board must decide the question of what is right or wrong." Cornell University, established largely as a city of refuge from ecclesiastical despotism and presided over for years by Andrew D. White, author of "The Warfare of Science against Theology," afforded an apparent exception. President Schurman spoke strongly for scientific freedom, but one of his trustees explained that he had evidently done so with mental reservations, since he (the president) had agreed with the board in dismissing a professor who held free silver views. Secretary Goodspeed, of Chicago University, said: "As to the government of universities, I am in accord with the views set forth in Mr. Raymond's letter. On all questions in our University the final, supreme authority is vested in the trustees." Mr. Ferd. W. Peck, one of the directors of Chicago

University, said: "The trustees should see to it that in teaching . . . no unsound financial doctrines nor anything of a dangerous character be taught." Being asked what would happen in case a professor should teach free silver, Judge Henry E. Holland, a trustee of Yale, replied: "Oh, in such a case he would be hauled up by the board; something like the case of last year at Brown University." James W. Alexander, a member of the board of directors at Princeton University, declared that "the board of trustees" were "the ultimate authority," and added: "In case there should be any differences the authority of the board would have to prevail. The professors would have to walk the plank." Similar statements from other educators or members of governing boards could be quoted.

Are these declarations idle talk? Instead, cases of proscription abound. Not to mention an extended list before me, concerning which I am bound to secrecy—eloquent testimonial to the potency of the black-list!—nor to dwell upon a second group that may be regarded as disputed, or in which efforts to unseat failed, I will note the following:

By the uncontradicted declaration to the writer (June, 1892) by members of the governing board of Lawrence University at Appleton, Wisconsin, in committee, Dr. George M. Steele was removed from the presidency of that institution because of his leanings "toward free trade and greenbacks." Dr. H. E. Stockbridge was driven from the presidency of North Dakota Agricultural College in 1893 for reasons clearly political. In 1894 Prof. Richard T. Ely of Wisconsin University was tried for sociological heresy and escaped conviction, according to the testimony of his friends, only after a desperate fight. Docent I. A. Hourwich of Chicago University participated in 1894 in a Populist convention and was given by Prof. Laughlin the alternative of resigning or eschewing politics. He resigned. Prof. Laughlin actively championed the gold standard in the campaign of 1896. Prof. E. W. Bemis was dismissed from Chicago University in 1895, and, despite wholesale denials by the university authorities, it is generally believed that but for

his opposition to certain private monopolies he would not have been molested. Prof. James Allen Smith was driven from Marietta College in 1897. Washington Gladden wrote (May 29, 1897), "There is no question that his dismissal was due to his anti-monopoly teaching." Almost a clean sweep of the liberal teachers at Marietta occurred at the same time. The matter was suppressed. President E. B. Andrews was officially asked to "forbear" to "promulgate" his views favoring the free coinage of silver, because "these views were so contrary to the views generally held by the friends of the University that the University had already lost gifts and legacies which would otherwise have come or have been assured to it, and that without change it would in the future fail to receive the pecuniary support which is requisite," etc. Dr. Andrews resigned. The resulting outcry forced the board to recede, but Dr. Andrews left the following year. The Rockefeller largess which was said to be pending dropped soon after into the treasury of Brown. Prof. John R. Commons proved *persona non grata* at Indiana University because of his economic doctrines. Later (1899) in Syracuse University support was withdrawn from his chair for the reason, as was widely believed, that his anti-monopoly attitude was offensive to Standard Oil influences. Professors Frank Parsons and E. W. Bemis were removed from the Kansas State Agricultural College in 1899 because of their position on economic questions, and Dr. D. J. H. Ward was simultaneously dismissed by the same board at the instigation of local clergymen because he was a Unitarian. Prof. George D. Herron's utterances on Applied Christianity necessitated his resignation from Iowa College in 1900. This was soon followed by the retirement of President George A. Gates, who had stood by Dr. Herron and had also offended the school-book trust. President Henry Wade Rogers suddenly resigned from Northwestern University in June, 1900. The above-quoted James H. Raymond was present at the board meeting. Treasurer R. D. Sheppard, also a trustee and present, said: "I will not deny that Mr. Rogers's anti-imperialistic speech a year ago in Cen-

tral Music Hall was criticized by members of the board of trustees, who took the ground that as head of the University he should not voice opinions that were antagonistic to the board of managers. . . . Not a man on the board voted for Bryan as against McKinley. . . . The moneyed men who have been its [the University's] patrons to the extent of giving large endowments to its funds are nearly all opposed to the political views expressed from time to time by Mr. Rogers. . . . William Deering . . . is about the only one of the number who ever has been regarded as even tolerant of Mr. Rogers's anti-imperialistic views." This is one case in which "views" were said to have cut no figure. The dismissal (1900) of Dr. E. A. Ross of Leland Stanford was investigated by a committee of the American Economic Association. This committee published a report of their findings showing their conviction that the dismissal was due to the professor's views on silver, coolie immigration, and municipal ownership—Mrs. Stanford objecting to them. Fifteen economists, including leaders of the conservative school in America, indorsed the report. Prof. George E. Howard of Leland Stanford, discussing the Ross case, said: "I do not worship Saint Market Street; I do not reverence Holy Standard Oil; nor do I doff my hat to the celestial Six Companies." He was required by Mrs. Stanford to make public apology or resign. He resigned.

All these men offended by opposing Republican policies. In the campaign of 1900 the *Chicago Record* polled several university faculties and found them heavily for McKinley. Aguinaldo, American prisoner, threatened with severe punishment unless he advise his people to surrender, issues the advice. This we are expected to take seriously; likewise professorial politics.

Shall we abandon education to plutocracy? Plutocracy will accept the responsibility. Porto Ricans are starving, but the Administration carefully educates them. Its friends say: "The hope of that fair land is in the children. By their ready assimilation of American ideas they constitute the ground-work of a new civil and moral order." Flattering offers have been

made to draw teachers to the Philippines, and General MacArthur is furnishing the Filipinos a specially prepared United States history. Yet education that throws light on the social problem is anathema. That it imparted such education was the crime of the Kansas State Agricultural College. Discussing Prof. Herron's Commencement address at that college while Gov. Stanley was raiding the Board of Regents, the *Kansas City Journal*, a railroad sheet, said (April 16, 1899): "If Kansas is bound to put up with this sort of education she had far better stay in ignorance and burn her colleges to the ground." If we abandon our educational institutions to the foes of liberty we deserve our fate.

What may we do? We may advertise the situation, rally to the rescue of our colleges, and insist that all sides shall be heard. More practical still, friends of freedom may unite on one institution and make of it for the social movement what Oberlin was for the anti-slavery movement. Shall we do it?

THOMAS ELMER WILL.

Ruskin College, Trenton, Mo.

POLITICAL MOVEMENT OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

THE fashion in kings has changed. In former times the sovereign power was in a few or in one person crowned supreme. The nineteenth century has crowned the people. In other days, by right of birth or conquest, a privileged few possessed the government as their private property. Now the public owns the government in theory and to a large extent in practise. Democracy has won upon the field of battle and in the halls of legislation, and government has been deeded to the people in vigorous compacts and solemn constitutions. The laws of selection and survival, which apply to principles and institutions as well as to individuals and races, have given their powerful sanction to popular government. The divine right of kings is extinct with the theories of ghosts and witches and other intellectual monstrosities of the past found fossil in our histories. The sovereignty of the people has become the fundamental thought of modern politics.

The new kings, like the old, are sometimes feeble-minded or inert, and their advisers or even their clowns may exercise for a time the actual power; but the right of kingship and sovereign power is in the people, and if the bosses rule it is in the name of the people and by their acknowledged right, and the people may take to themselves the real power and perfect the machinery of popular government whenever they have the *mind* to do so.

The white light of civilized democracy is a new thing on this planet.* Throughout the past, in varying depths and com-

* The so-called "democracies" or "republics" of former times were not democracies or republics at all, except perhaps in the case of some primitive uncivilized communities. In *Athens* at its best four-fifths of the people were slaves. The governing power was not in the mass of the people, but in a small part of the people. Five out of every six men had no vote or civic right, being either slaves or unenfranchised metics (aliens)—20,000 enfranchised Athenians in a population of half a mil-

binations, the clouds of despotism and barbarism have shadowed the continents. Till near the end of the eighteenth century, the world clear round was dark, with only a half light here and there to tinge the gloom with gray, or a meteor's flash to fade and die in the undiminished night. But just before our century, as the dawn before the day, the light of liberty in broad and deepening flood poured on the peoples through the gates of revolution. Then began the giant move-

lion. The entire working classes and many traders and artificers who would be reckoned now as belonging to the middle classes were without political rights. The internal organization of the ruling class was democratic, but there was no government by the people, no democracy, only a democratic-aristocracy. Yet this Athens in the time of Pericles, of which we have been speaking, is lauded by historians as a pure democracy. And in fact it was the nearest approach to popular government to be found in any ancient civilization, though but one man in six had a vote. *Sparta* never advanced beyond a close oligarchy of hard and narrow-minded landowners and oppressed helots who tilled the soil.

"In all the Greek 'democracies' the slaves, who formed the entire working classes, were denied any share of political power." (May on Democracy, 55, 64.)

When *Rome* drove out her Tarquin kings, 509 B. C., and established what the historians call "The Republic," all power was in the patricians—all laws were made and all offices held by them. The plebeians constituting the masses of the people had no political rights. They began a struggle for political equality, but long before they won their civic rights (completed 286 B. C. by the Hortensian laws giving force to the decrees of the popular assembly) conquest and the law of debt had filled the city with a mass of slaves. With a powerful nobility at the top and a multitude of slaves at the bottom there was no real republic in Rome. How loosely the word is used in our histories may be judged by the fact that the "Republic" is said to have continued until 30 B. C., though eighteen years before that date Cæsar had crossed the Rubicon and established an imperial despotism, though under the forms of republican government. He seized the government by force and ruled with absolute power, until his assassination by Brutus for the very reason that he had "overturned the Republic," which, translated into fact, means that he had swallowed into his one person all the powers which had formerly belonged to the citizen classes or compound aristocracy of which Brutus was a member. It was literally true, as Shakespeare's Antony says, "but yesterday the word of Cæsar might have stood against the world." He was the imperial ruler of the known world. Historians have classified governments mainly by their outward forms and pretenses, and not by their actual nature and substance. Even in the days of her nearest approach to democracy Rome was despotic in her attitude to conquered territory. The people of Italy even were not accorded Roman citizenship till after Augustus, when citizenship had ceased to carry political power.

The "free cities" of Italy, France, and Germany, so famous for their freedom in the Middle Ages, were not democracies, but like Athens were merely democratic-aristocracies—oligarchies with a democratic organization on the inside, but despotic on the outside. The agricultural workers and the masses of the laboring classes generally had no share in the government. The cities were "free" because they were not sub-

ment that has scattered the forces of the night, and with ever-increasing power has pushed, and is still pushing, the nations up the slope of democracy toward the sovereignty of all, and an organization that shall make that sovereignty wise, continuous, and effective.

DEMOCRACY AND LIBERTY A HUNDRED YEARS AGO.

In 1800, the *United States* had just thrown off the English

ject to the prevailing feudal obligations—their citizens were not serfs or vassals of the local nobility; but they were not free in the modern sense, for they did not have government by and for the people, but government by and for a body of nobles, or a commercial aristocracy.

The agricultural laborers of Europe had no share in the government of the Middle Ages, and, "with insignificant exceptions outside of America, it was reserved for the nineteenth century to make this advance." (Adams: *Civilization in the Middle Ages*, pp. 306, 307.) "Even within the self-governing cities the governments were not democratic, and the distinctions between patricians and common people were as clearly drawn as outside their walls." (*Ibid.*, 306.) The tillers of the soil always, and city laborers for the most part, were excluded from the exercise of political rights, which were monopolized by a privileged order. (Lavissee, *Histoire Generale*, 452.)

The principle of the rights of man was unknown in the free cities of the Middle Ages. "The idea [of government by the people] would have been impossible to the Middle Ages. It would have been foreign to all its notions." (Adams: *Civilization in the Middle Ages*, 306.) "The Italian Republics consisted of a small body of burghers, who alone had the privilege of government, together with a large population, who, though they paid taxes and shared the commercial and social advantages of the city, had no voice in its administration." (Symonds: *The Republics in "The Renaissance,"* 128.) Venice, one of the "independent republics" of Italy, was ruled by her patricians in the early period, and later by a close oligarchy brought to a focus in the despotic Council of Ten. In 1581 Venice had a population of 134,800, of which only 1,843 were adult patricians, and by no means all of those had a share in the government, for in 1297 the Great Council was made a close hereditary chamber, and in 1311 the Council of Ten was established with power substantially absolute.

Of all the free cities, Florence was the "foremost in freedom," yet she was ruled first by her nobles, then by her commercial aristocracy, and finally by one leading family of her plutocracy. Aside from evanescent forms of revolution, her freest government left the actual power of the State in a mercantile aristocracy consisting of the 7 Greater Guilds. The 14 Lesser Guilds were also citizens, but could elect only one-fourth of the signory or other group of officers, the Greater Guilds electing the rest. Below these groups of citizens was a large body who had no civic rights, although they paid taxes. Below these was the great bulk of manual workers who did not pay taxes, and had nothing to do with the government except in times of revolution. (Varchi, *Storia Fiorentina*, lib. III., cap. 22.)

In the free cities of Northern Europe also the Greater Guilds (composed of burghers, usually employers of labor) generally held the municipal government in their grasp. "The working classes could gain admittance to the greater trades by giving up manual labor for a year and a day," a condition practically prohibitive to the mass of artificers

yoke and established a great Republic in the New World; but, to leave some adequate work for future reformers, the slavery that existed throughout the greater part of the Republic was recognized and protected by the Constitution. The ordinance of 1787 prevented the importation of slaves into the northwest territory, but slaves already there before the

bound to the lower trades (May, 17). In some cases the lower or "craft-guilds" attained a share in the government, as in the Italian cities, but except in spasms the dominant power remained with the wealthy burghers, and a mass of manual laborers besides the agricultural workers were outside the guilds altogether and had no civic rights at all. "The people" in the Middle Ages meant the nobles and commercial aristocracy. There was no effort to secure the rights of citizenship to the whole body of the people; there was simply a struggle of classes each seeking to capture the government for itself.

Holland is described as free in the Middle Ages, especially in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and in the latter part of the sixteenth century, when the "Republic" was proclaimed. But the country was full of feudal nobles and their peasant subjects, the cities were oligarchies, and "the States General, which exercised supreme power in the republic, consisted of delegates from the provincial assemblies, which were chosen by the municipal magistrates of the different cities, who were themselves self-elected. . . . Nowhere was there popular election; the representation was municipal throughout." (May, 65.) And the municipalities were aristocracies. The country people and for the most part the working classes in the cities had no part in the government—the mass of the population was out of power. In 1795, upon the invasion of a French revolutionary army, a free constitution was established proclaiming the sovereignty of the people and the rights of man, abolishing feudal customs and titles of nobility, overthrowing the ancient municipal constitution of the provinces, and providing for a representative assembly to be chosen by universal suffrage. The Dutch were free on paper, but instead of attaining self-government they found they had merely changed masters. They were treated as a subject province of France and remained under French domination till the fall of Napoleon.

The forest cantons of Switzerland have been for ages the freest spots in Europe—the freest spots on earth, perhaps, before American liberty was born. But these communities, however free, were primitive—no cities and towns with commerce and manufactures and the complex organization of society, nothing but little townships of mountain farms, with a convent here and there—mere patches of primeval liberty walled in by the white-capped Alps. In the more developed cantons the governments were oligarchies. In Berne, for example, out of 360 burgher families, 80 (and in 1776 only 18) formed the ruling oligarchy in a population of 250,000 to 300,000 people. Such aristocracies continued until the nineteenth century, one of the provisions of the constitution of 1848 being for the overthrow of the oligarchies.

Passing from local government to Switzerland as a whole, we find that when she shook off the Austrian yoke and freed herself from the Empire she passed under the domination of France and so remained till 1814. In the sixteenth century the French king was a controlling factor in Swiss affairs, and throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the confederation was practically a dependency of France. In the national sphere, self-government was not attained till the nineteenth century.

Among some primitive peoples, such as our Saxon ancestors and the

ordinance took effect were not emancipated. New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Connecticut had provided for gradual abolition by prohibiting importation and enacting that children should be free at birth or on attaining a given age, etc. Only in Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts

ancient Jews, democracies existed more or less like those of the primitive forest cantons of Switzerland. But such governments are not entitled to be called *civilized* democracies. A little, undeveloped, homogeneous social group may form a democracy, but the *union of civilisation and democracy* is a very different thing. Division of labor, separation of manufactures, commerce, and agriculture, development of cities and towns, organization of military force, complex judicial and administrative functions, and large industrial interests—these are the things that create inequality and put the strain upon democracy. Organization usually overwhelms the primitive democracy, and establishes monarchic or aristocratic institutions. Only the *civilized democracy*, that thoroughly understands the value of free government, founds itself on constitutional guaranties and popular education and controls organization for the benefit of all,—only such a democracy can be relied upon to endure the strain of civilization. Of all the civilized communities of the world (so far as we have knowledge) down to 1800, there was only one in which the government from top to bottom was in the control of the great body of the people, and that one was our own United States.



Rex.

Ludovicus.

Ludovicus Rex.

(Caricature of Louis XIV, by Thackeray.)

"You see at once that majesty is made out of the wig, the high-heeled shoes and cloak, all *flours-de-lis* bespangled.... Thus do barbers and cobblers make the gods that we worship." — *Thackeray*.

(which then included Maine) was slavery extinct by law.* Government by the people, therefore, free of slavery or despotism, existed only in a small part of the United States.

In *France*, the revolutionists had stormed the Bastille, destroyed the Bourbon throne, and framed a republican constitution; but arbitrary rule was organized by cliques of elected despots, and the country was really controlled by successive tyrannies of terrific factions until the people were glad to accept the more orderly and intelligent despotism of Napoleon, who seized the government by a *coup d'état* in 1797 and became First Consul in 1799 under a constitution that placed all power in his hands. Laws were to be drafted by a Council of State, discussed by a second body—the Tribune, which could not vote—and voted by a legislative assembly that could not discuss. But back of all was the initiative of the First Consul, without which no project of law could be drawn. The direction of administration and the whole appointing power were in the same hands.†

Even local government was swept within Napoleon's power. "A system of centralization came in force with which France under her kings had nothing to compare. . . . Where, under the constitution of 1791, a body of local representatives had met to conduct the business of the department, was now a Préfet appointed by the First Consul, absolute like the First Consul himself, and assisted only by the advice of a nominated council, which met for one fortnight in the year. . . . Even the 40,000 maires, with their communal councils, were all appointed directly or indirectly by the chief of the State."§

With the army, the administration, the appointing power, and the initiative in the hands of Bonaparte, the French Re-

* The settlers of Vermont in 1777 framed a constitution forever excluding slavery from that commonwealth. New Hampshire abolished slavery in 1784, and the phrase, "All men are born free and equal," in the Massachusetts constitution of 1780, amounted to abolition according to the interpretation established by judicial decision in 1783, when the question came before the Supreme Court.

† Judson, p. 48.

§ Fyffe I., 207.

public was no more a republic than Rome was a republic when Cæsar was First Consul, with the army, the appointing power, and the legislative initiative in his grasp. In 1804 the thin veil of the consulship was removed, and the soldier of the revolution became Emperor of the French in name as well as in fact.

Holland and Switzerland, like France, had recently acquired free institutions, with equal political rights and no taint of slavery or serfdom, but both were largely affected with oligarchy in local government and both were under the thumb of Napoleon—the actual control was an external despotism. The little republic of Andorra in the Pyrennees was also under French control.

In all of Europe no other country bigger than a township was on the whole so free as *England*, yet she was ruled by a landed aristocracy. She had her Magna Charta, her House of Commons, and her Bill of Rights; there was no serfage; local self-government was established and the press was free: but the middle classes and the working people had no ballot and no share in the national government. Through a greatly restricted suffrage, faulty distribution of representatives, bribery, and office-buying, a small class of wealthy nobles controlled the House of Commons. In 1801 the House had 658 members, 425 of whom were chosen and controlled by 252 wealthy and influential patrons. Parliament, which held the sovereign power, was entirely controlled by the nobles. Such a parliament it was, full of the aristocracy and their vassals, that had driven the American Colonists to revolution, and joined the continental enemies of democracy seeking to crush the French because they had declared for Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity and acted on the right of the people to elect their rulers. England even avowed her purpose of continuing the war till France should give security, by the restoration of the Bourbons, that she had laid aside the principles on which her revolution was founded. With such aristocratic rule at home, no part of the empire subject to English government could be considered free.

South America from the Isthmus to the Cape was under the heel of foreign despotism, for the most part Spanish and Portuguese. *Africa* and *Asia* were in night without a star. In all the world there were only the little town of San Marino, the last remnant of Italian liberty, and the infant United States that enjoyed the blessings of civilized government free of actual despotism over the masses of the people; and San Marino's government, though not actually despotic, was oligarchic rather than republican, nearly all power being vested in a chamber of sixty elected for life. So that the United States (extending at that time only from the Mississippi to the Atlantic above the Florida line) was the sole possessor of effective liberty—the only country with popular government in real control of affairs; and even this one-fiftieth of the world was tainted for the most part with the pestilence of slavery—about 800,000 slaves in a population of 5,308,000—only three States ($\frac{1}{830}$ of the world and $\frac{1}{850}$ of the people) were democratic and free of slavery.

DEMOCRACY IN 1900.

In 1900, the democratic principle, free of the taint of slavery, rules the world of civilization. In comparison with the past, *America, Australia, and civilised Europe are free*. After three efforts, *France* at last succeeded in establishing a lasting republic in 1871. The impulse of the revolution and the successive waves of democratic feeling that swept over Europe, especially in 1830, 1848, and the latter half of the century, demolished absolutism and established parliamentary rule in nearly all the States of Western Europe. Constitutional government and popular elections have been adopted in country after country, sometimes through insurrection and sometimes through peaceable agitation, till even *Spain* established a republic in 1873, and, though unable to maintain it free of allegiance to the throne, she has still a responsible minister and lower house of parliament chosen by universal suffrage. The Czar of *Russia*, the Sultan of *Turkey*, and the Grand Duke of *Mecklenburg-Schwerin* are the only absolute rulers left in Europe; all other

governments are constitutional, with the fundamental powers of legislation and taxation in the hands of the people. Turkey is uncivilized, Russia only semi-civilized, and the people of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, though without a State constitution and seemingly satisfied with local absolutism, taxation and legislation by Duke instead of by parliament, nevertheless elect their representatives to the Reichstag (or parliament) of the Empire.

France and *Switzerland* are republican in substance and in form. *England* is republican in fact, though not in form. Her king is a mere figurehead, with no actual power even to veto an act of Parliament. The House of Lords has repeatedly found itself unable to resist the Commons, and the Commons are elected by the people. The Reform bill of 1832 extended the suffrage and reapportioned the representation, thereby transferring power from the wealthy and titled to the great middle classes. The measures of 1867 and 1884 still further extended the suffrage, including at last the artisans and agricultural laborers—every citizen whose holding or lodging is worth £10 a year (a \$50 annual rental, or a holding or use that would be of that value if rent were paid for it); so that the actual sovereignty now is in the great body of the people.

Canada and *Australia* are practically free republics. They govern their own affairs, without despotic control or interference from England, and their relations with the empire amount simply to a federation for international purposes. The federation has the cordial assent of the colonies, and England would do well to put the union sentiment on record by a referendum vote of the provinces and organize it in a federal constitution, defining the rights of the States and admitting their representatives to the Federal Parliament.

England's conduct in *South Africa*, like that of the United States in the *Philippines*, appears to show a weakening of the political movement toward democracy and self-government; but in truth the despotic forces at work are chiefly industrial, not political, and when the clouds of conflict have rolled away it will be seen that the love of political liberty has been grow-

ing all the time in England and America, although just now the love of wealth for ourselves may be growing faster than our love of liberty for other people.

One after another the countries of *Central and South America* have thrown off the Spanish yoke, or other external control, and established republican government with constitutional guaranties, and suffrage always wide and often universal. The grade of civilization is not as high as in most of our States, and the power of presidents and demagogues is sometimes very great—greater than the constitution warrants in some cases just as it is with us now and then; but the ultimate power is none the less in the people by the construction of the government, notwithstanding the fact that they do not always exercise their power in these countries, any more than they do in New York or Philadelphia or in our national government.

Japan abolished serfdom in 1871, and in 1889 her emperor granted a liberal constitution, with a parliament of peers and representatives having powers of legislation and controlling finances. The representatives and the local officers and councils that govern the municipalities are elected by the whole body of male Japs who have attained the age of twenty-five years and pay a small tax. *Cape Colony* and *Natal* enjoy a large degree of liberty; and self-government, though interrupted by war, will doubtless be reëstablished in the *Transvaal* and the *Orange Free State* on a broader basis perhaps than that provided by the heroic Boers, whose freedom cause we love but whose narrow and exclusive policy in the past we deplore. *Guiana* (French, English, and Dutch) is not an independent republic or democracy. *Asia* and *Africa* are still almost completely dark, but do not count in any review of the civilized world.

While studying nineteenth century movements for this series of articles, an assistant tabulated for me all the countries of the world for 1800 and for 1900, showing the government in form and in fact, with the population and area, of every country in existence at each of those dates. For 1800, we could find

but one free country, while the tables show that fifty countries now have popular government, free of despotic control and clear of the taint of slavery or serfdom.*

Chattel slavery is not quite dead yet—slaves are still hunted in Africa and held in some barbarous regions. But the civilized world is free of it, and the grand movement against it is one of the nineteenth century's strongest titles to our admiration.

Throughout the Americas, Australia, and civilized Europe *manhood suffrage* is the basis of government, with varying provisions in respect to age, residence, criminality, etc., 'to guard the ballot against the lack of due intelligence, character, and interest—mild educational or property qualifications such as the ordinary man may easily attain being sometimes added to the common safeguards, with here and there, as in some of our Southern States, an effort to use restrictions of this sort to cover a class disfranchisement. A law that excludes the mass of the people, the bulk of the families in the State, is not in accord with the principles of republican government, and is in vigorous contrast with the practically universal suffrage that

* In England, Normandy, Baden, and Denmark, feudal serfdom lost its life before the French Revolution. The revolution swept it out of France, Holland, and Switzerland. Bavaria abolished it in 1808, Prussia in 1809, Austria in 1811, Wurtemberg in 1817, Mecklenberg in 1820, Saxony in 1832, Hungary in 1848, and so on till all the slaves of the soil in Europe were liberated, Russia joining the liberty column in 1861, when Alexander II. emancipated forty-six millions of serfs. The slave trade was stopped by Austria in 1782, by the French Convention in 1794, by England in 1807, and by this country in 1808. The Swedish trade closed in 1813, the Dutch in 1814. The Allies declared against it at Vienna in 1815, and Napoleon in the Hundred Days abolished it a few weeks later. Spain agreed to end the business in 1820; Brazil stopped it in 1826; Venezuela, Chili, and other South American States prohibited it as they acquired independence; and the Spanish government declared it piracy in 1865. In the later years of the century the civilized powers under the lead of Great Britain have earnestly sought to stop the traffic in Africa. In 1877 Egypt signed a convention prohibiting the slave trade in or across that country, and in 1890 a "General Act" for the repression of slave-hunting was agreed to by Turkey, Persia, the Congo Free State, Zanzibar, all the European maritime powers, and the United States.

All the slaves in the British Empire were freed in 1834, with compensation (£20,000,000) to their owners.

Lincoln, in 1862, proclaimed the emancipation of all the slaves in States remaining in rebellion on New Year's Day, 1863. The slave States not in rebellion soon after freed their negroes—whereby four million blacks were liberated in America; and in 1865 the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution was adopted to prohibit slavery forever on our soil. Brazil abolished slavery, 1867-1888.

obtains in most of our States and in France, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Prussia, Austria, Spain, Great Britain, Australia, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, the Argentine Republic, Ecuador, Bolivia, Colombia, etc.

In four of our States and in New Zealand, West Australia, South Australia, Madras, and the Isle of Man, *women* have secured the full suffrage (all since 1869 and mostly since 1890); and school, municipal, or other partial suffrage has been accorded them in twenty-six of our States, and in England, Scotland, Ireland, Canada (Ontario and Quebec), New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Manitoba, British Columbia and the Northwest Territory, Cape Colony, Tasmania, and parts of Australia (Victoria and New South Wales), Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Russia, France, Italy, and parts of Austria-Hungary.*

The area of countries in which the principle of woman suffrage has been recognized in the last thirty years, by the

* In some of these cases of partial suffrage the law limits the ballot to special classes of women, such as landowners, taxpayers, etc. The very narrow provision of Italy is simply that widows may vote by proxy. In France, women teachers may elect women to the school boards, and women engaged in commerce have since 1898 the right to vote for judges of the tribunals of commerce.

18th CENTURY.19th CENTURY.

passage of laws or constitutional provisions securing at least a partial suffrage to women, is about 20,000,000 square miles, with a population of about 400,000,000, or roughly one-third of the world ($\frac{3}{5}$ of the land area and $\frac{1}{15}$ of the population). The whole extent and depth of political life are not yet illumined in all these countries, but the light has begun to shine on them all, and its power is steadily increasing.

Progress must be noted also in the direction of perfecting the *methods and machinery of popular government*—the Australian ballot, civil service reform, proportional representation in Belgium and Switzerland, direct legislation in Switzerland and the United States, direct nominations by petition or by primary election, preferential voting, corrupt practises acts, the auto-

THE VETO POWER IN THE HANDS OF THE PEOPLE.



1. POLITICIAN TO VOTER: "State your opinion on these matters, please."

matic ballot, provisions against special legislation and for municipal liberty, home made charters, etc.*

Of all governmental methods after the secret ballot, direct legislation and direct nominations are the most vital in a complex community, because they are the fundamental means of securing and protecting the substance and the forms of freedom. Direct legislation affords the people an immediate veto on the corrupt or undesirable acts of their legislative agents; and in spite of the blockade of private, class, or corporate interests in the legislatures, it enables the people to

* See *City for the People*, Equity Series, 1520 Chestnut Street. Philadelphia, for the facts about these movements, especially the development of direct legislation and municipal liberty.

EXTENSION OF THE PEOPLE'S VETO TO FRANCHISE STEALS, ETC.



2. VOTER TO POLITICIAN: "Let me see those bills in your pocket also."

POLITICIAN: "Hold on, there; you don't know enough to vote on those things."

establish equal suffrage, municipal liberty, popular election of Senators, progressive taxation, public ownership, coöperative organization of trusts, manufactures, commerce, and agriculture, proportional representation, the merit system, direct nominations, popular recall, full education, and all the other measures needful to perfect the form and substance of democracy. The referendum with the initiative perfects the representative system, abolishes the private monopoly of legislation that characterizes lawmaking by final vote of elected delegates, destroys the concentration of temptation that exists where a small body of men can vote away public franchises and grant other valuable privileges and immunities, makes the sovereignty of the people continuous and effective instead of spasmodic and partial, and transforms elected legislators into agents acting under the instruction and the veto of the people. It is essential to self-government—the only means of guarding the representative system so that it shall be really representative and shall not become a mastery instead of an agency. For these reasons, the adoption of the initiative and referendum in Switzerland and the rapid extension of their use in the United States in recent years, together with an earnest and widespread movement for their full adoption, constitute one of the most important indications of the vigorous trend toward popular government.

Not less important is the substitution of direct nominations by petition or primary election in place of the caucus and convention system. The power of political "bosses" and "machines" depends very largely on their control over caucus and convention nominations. Direct nomination is one of the surest means of transferring power from the schemers to the people, and the movements in this direction in New Zealand and the United States are among the most important facts in the history of democracy.

The establishment of municipal liberty, or local self-government in local affairs, is also of moment in this connection. Five States have accorded municipalities the right to frame their own charters, and many others have given towns

and cities more or less complete control over local franchises and municipal business. The development of free speech and a free press, and the growth of free schools with an extensive system of public instruction, are vigorous symptoms of democracy. Progressive taxation of monopoly values, incomes, and inheritances, division of large estates, labor legislation, compulsory arbitration, public recognition of the right to employment, and old-age pensions, in New Zealand, indicate the strength of the tendency to equalization in the most advanced communities. And, finally, the remarkable development of public ownership all over the civilized world, and the growth of coöperative industry in Europe and Australasia, must be noted as manifestations of the democratic movement in the field wherein the next great battle with despotism is to be fought. This will be dealt with later when we come to the special study of material progress, the concentration of wealth, and the trend to industrial equalization.

Let us now sum up the civic contrasts between the beginning and the end of this great *Century of Democracy*, noting the relation between civilization and free institutions, and then investigate the *causes* that have undermined the sovereignty of kings and put political power in the hands of the people.

FRANK PARSONS.

Boston University School of Law.

WHEN WILL THE BUBBLE BURST?

JOHAN LAW was a great man. His greatness ran in financiering. Perhaps he was the greatest of all financiers. At any rate he evolved a successful system for winning at faro, and when his other schemes failed he was still able to make a "respectable living" by means of that system. What other evidence need there be of his greatness?

There is a remarkable historical parallel between John Law and J. Pierpont Morgan—only Mr. Morgan does not play faro; his favorite game is solitaire.

The tendency of the present time is toward the formation of trusts, the amalgamation of these trusts into still greater trusts, the community of interest in great transportation corporations, the bringing together into unison of management all the various forms of Mammon. All these have their prototype in the financiering exploits of John Law about 180 years ago.

J. Pierpont Morgan has placed the commercial and financial interests of a great nation under one control. That has happened but once before in the history of the world, and that was when John Law cornered the money and the commerce of France.

If we wish to cast a horoscope of the future we have not to resort to an astrologer. History furnishes one for us. The unchanging and unchangeable law of cause and effect, that of historical sequence, is as certain as was that of the Medes and Persians. It rolls on like the relentless car of Juggernaut crushing all before it.

Mr. Morgan is the head of the great syndicate that holds the monopoly of this country. It is largely through his rare ability as an organizer, his brilliant conception and execution of financial schemes that are almost appalling in their magnitude, that the great transportation lines of the continent have been brought into close relations with one another, within one own-

ership, or so closely allied as to be practically under one control. In accomplishing this many railroads have been financed. The financiering of a railroad means that a syndicate has been formed representing capital at the head of which is a skilled operator representing brain power. The brain power discovers that by the refunding of bonds, the rearranging of stock issues (sometimes accompanied by a receivership or a foreclosure, and possibly by a rate war, to bring opposing interests to a realization of what is good for them), by some judicious changes of and economies in management, and by proper traffic arrangement with other lines, a railroad may be made to produce a larger revenue in proportion to the actual market value of its securities than formerly. Often the word "wrecking" is applied to some of these processes, but that is a vulgar term. It is much more polite to describe it as a readjustment of the road's securities to meet changed circumstances. The expected resultant increased revenue in proportion to former actual market value is capitalized and appears in the reorganization in an increased issue of stocks and bonds. The syndicate takes this increase for itself, for it is the value that it has created, and the investors in the road are no better off than they were before. Sometimes they are not as well off, though often they reap the advantage of greater activity in the stock market, thus being afforded an opportunity to unload. If, as may happen, their certificates, which were formerly quoted at say 60, have advanced to 80, it will generally be found that the financiering process has resulted in scaling down the amounts, and the man who held one hundred of the old receives but seventy-five of the new. The methods of different operators differ somewhat, and the financial condition of some roads may demand a slightly different process; but the ultimate result is just the same, if the brain power and the capital are able to bring matters to a successful issue.

By the consolidation of various railroads many savings in the cost of operation are accomplished. It costs a good deal less to haul a carload of freight from Chicago to Boston when

every mile of track over which it passes is under one management than it does when the car has to be transferred to another road at Detroit, again at Buffalo, and again at Albany. The net earnings are again increased by the ability to prevent disastrous rate wars, especially if the competing roads are brought under the same community of ownership. The increased net earnings that are expected from these consolidations are again capitalized and go to reward the syndicate that engineered the deal.

The same principle operates in the industrials. Several manufacturers in the same line become convinced that by co-operation they can reduce expenses and minimize competition. They consolidate. The expected savings through consolidation are capitalized, and the shrewd manipulator, who convinced the manufacturers of the wisdom of consolidation and financed the deal, walks off with the additional capitalization. Such has been the history of the trusts that have been formed.

The origin and the rapid increase of the wealth of most, if not all, of the great financiers of the day can be traced back to just such operations as these. Instead of the "squeezing out" process employed by manipulators in smaller concerns, they have been content to let the "other fellow" have the ordinary return for his investment; but the profit accruing from increased economies and judicious combinations, and which the increased capitalization represents, always finds its way into the safe deposit vaults to which the financiers alone hold the key.

The formation of trusts of the old-fashioned kind, the kind that grew so familiar in the golden era that followed the financial depression of 1893, of necessity ceased with the passing of the century. There were no more fields to conquer. Everything had gone into a trust. Thence the step was but natural to the Trust of trusts. The financier in the twentieth century was bound not to fall behind the marvelous financial progress of the nineteenth. *Excelsior* was his watchword, and he progressed onward and upward. The eight different mammoth corporations that had divided between them the various

branches of the iron and steel industry were brought together into one Gargantuan corporation, the magnitude of which could scarcely have been comprehended a few years ago.

The United States Steel Corporation has a capitalization of \$1,154,000,000 in stocks and bonds. Of this vast aggregate some \$125,000,000 represents the capitalization of the expected economies to result from the new corporation. This \$125,000,000 goes of course to the syndicate headed by J. Pierpont Morgan, and represents their fair and equitable earnings in organizing this monster trust. It represents value they created, and it is but just that it should be theirs!

Mr. Morgan is the head of a syndicate that stands to-day as the principal factor of the financial world—one might almost say as the financial world itself. Behind him are European financiers, who hold kings and empires in their clutches, and the great money kings of the New World. There is presented the spectacle of the "community of ownership" of the Rockefellers, of the Vanderbilts, of Carnegie, of Hill, of Harriman, of Whitney, of countless other multimillionaires, and J. Pierpont Morgan stands forth as the accredited representative of that community of ownership.

The oil interests, the coal interests, the railroad interests from sea to sea, the iron and steel interests, the great banking interests—all are closely allied under one common control, and every other large financial interest in the country is so involved with or dependent on them as to come under the same influence.

What will be the eventual result of this vast aggrandizement of capital, this constant unifying of the business of the country? Ossa can be piled on Pelion; but, if many other Ossas and many other Pelions are brought and piled on top, the pile growing higher and higher, will not the resulting pile be apt to have its center of gravity moved without the base?

That was precisely what happened as a result of the financial operations of the J. Pierpont Morgan of the early part of the eighteenth century. John Law was the ablest financier of his age, the ablest that Europe had at that time seen. He was a

thorough student of economics and of finance. He had made himself a complete master of everything that could be learned by an analytical and exhaustive examination of financial subjects and of the financial system of every European nation. He was not a visionary, but a remarkably shrewd man of affairs. This estimate of him is based on a broad view, not on the narrow one that would proclaim the successful revolutionist a patriot and the unsuccessful one a rebel—the successful speculator a financier and the unsuccessful one a fool.

When John Law organized the Bank of France in 1716 the finances of the nation were in what seemed a hopeless state, national securities were all but valueless, and royalty was bankrupt. In a short time he brought order out of chaos and established national and commercial credit. His banking system was far in advance of anything that Europe had then known. The notes of his bank found ready acceptance, and were as safe and secure as those of any bank ever known, before or since. Through his bank he was the bulwark of national credit. The management of the bank brought him in close touch with all the various commercial interests of the country. He saw opportunities for economies of management and increased revenues through consolidation. The unification of the business of the country was entered upon. Once entered upon it proceeded along the same general lines that have characterized the financial operations of the present day.

Law no more anticipated the ultimate bringing together of all the various commercial interests, when he first floated the West Indian Company in 1717, than did the New York banker when he engineered the absorption of the West Shore into the Vanderbilt system. The gradual expansion, the seeking for new commercial interests to conquer, followed in one case just as in the other. There was not the range of opportunities for speculation, for financiering, in those days that there is now. There were no railroads, no coal fields, no oil fields, no steel mills, no extensive manufacturing industries. Man had not then learned to confine steam, to control electricity, to seek fortune in the bowels of the earth, to substitute iron for ma-

sonry and timber, to produce usefulness out of waste—to do those countless things that enter into the business of to-day. But such opportunities for financial exploitation as there were came within the range of the Scotchman who had come to the relief of the French national treasury. They embraced the commerce of the country with its colonies and with the Orient, the handling of the State revenues, the refunding of the State debt, and the control of the coinage.

To the West Indian Company was granted by charter the control of the trade of Louisiana and the sovereignty of that province, as well as the fur trade of Canada. But there were other provinces and other countries with which France had commercial relations, and their trade was brought under the unifying influence of John Law. Reorganizations and recapitalizations followed in quick succession, until in 1719 the resultant trust, the Indian Company, controlled French trade in America, Africa, and Asia, and either directly or through its banking ally held control of the State revenues, which had been farmed out to it, the coinage of the country, and the management of the national debt. It was supreme in its absolute control of finance, and the government was practically at its command.

It is not intended in this discussion to point out the strong or weak points of Law's financial schemes, nor to give a historical account of what is known as the "Mississippi Bubble," but merely to call attention to its great similarity to financial exploitation of the present day, allowance being made for the world's progress in the intervening 182 years. The same methods employed by Law then, if employed to-day, would have produced the same result as that accomplished by Mr. Morgan; or perhaps, as a more fortunate manner of expressing it, the methods employed by Mr. Morgan now, if they had been employed in the days of John Law, would have produced the same result as Law's.

It may be interesting to note, though foreign to the subject of this inquiry, that Law conceived the idea of doing away with Parliament, whose function at that time was solely in connec-

tion with the raising of taxes, and to raise the State revenues through commercial grants. This idea is seen in practical operation in some States at the present time, where the effort is made to defray the expenses of government out of taxes laid on corporations as a payment for their charter rights. It might be a valuable experiment to try Law's plan *in toto*, and do away entirely with some modern Parliaments!

Whatever were the inherent weaknesses of Law's financial methods, it is made evident by M. Thiers's careful review of the subject that the Mississippi Bubble burst not through any fault in the scheme but through its own greatness—from its very magnitude. Embracing as the Indian Company did the whole range of commercial enterprise and financial opportunity, when it could no more speculate in the future, when it had reached the limit of expansion, it could no longer detract attention from the real rather than the speculative value of its shares. Then came the crash.

Its very vastness placed it beyond the power of any man or syndicate to control the market with a steady hand and give the stock the proper support when beset by the "bulls and bears." Then, too, there was added that fatality which endangers all corporate exploitation, the realization when the market reaches a high figure by some of the insiders, which in more instances than can be enumerated has brought ruin or serious loss. Russell Sage might tell an interesting little story of an affair of that nature happening to a pet stock of his once upon a time, and there is not a stock manipulator in any bourse of the world but is more fearful of the treachery of his associates than of the schemes of those whose interests lie on the other side of the market.

"Overcapitalization" might be charged as the primary cause of Law's failure. You have often seen one of those large sponges that the coachman uses sometimes in washing the carriage and the harness. How large and heavy it is when it is taken from the pail! How small and light it is when the water has been squeezed out! Just imagine if you can what would be the appearance of the United States Steel Corporation's

\$1,154,000,000 of capitalization if it underwent a similar squeezing process. The watering of stock is by no means a lost art.

John Law, before the bursting of the bubble, had accomplished in the financial world of 1719 substantially what J. Pierpont Morgan has in that of 1901. Will the parallel stop there?

It is to be hoped that Mr. Morgan will be able to keep a strong hold on the market and prevent any undue fluctuation in the allied stocks, and that the great financial houses and capitalists with whom he is associated will none of them seek to withdraw secretly from his support; else there will certainly follow such a feverish condition in the market as will make the Wall street of to-day rival the Rue Quincampoix of 1719.

It is to be hoped the bubble will not burst, but that its iridescence will continue to attract the admiration of the world until such time as the corporation shall be absorbed by the nation and the natural advantages and public franchises become the property of the people. When Mr. Morgan and his associates can realize by unloading on the government, and the management of the various enterprises shall become a governmental function, then their great wealth will enable Mr. Morgan to establish a hospital, Mr. Rockefeller to endow a college, and Mr. Carnegie to build a library in every city and village in the land.

ROBERT A. WOOD.

Washington, D. C.

JAMES A. HERNE: ACTOR, DRAMATIST, AND
MAN.

An Appreciation by HAMLIN GARLAND, J. J. ENNEKING, and
B. O. FLOWER.

I. HIS SINCERITY AS A PLAYWRIGHT.

WHEN I first met James A. Herne and his brave little wife, they were fighting a losing battle with a play called "Drifting Apart." This was in the first months of 1889, and all through 'ninety and 'ninety-one, and the summer of 'ninety-two, ill-luck pursued them. I saw a great deal of them during those years, and their sincerity of purpose as well as their unconquerable courage won my profound admiration. They had the highest ideals of what the drama should be, and they never swerved from the course which Mr. Herne himself outlined in his first letter to me, written in answer to a criticism I had made of "Drifting Apart." He believed that a drama should interest,—he knew it must do that,—but he also insisted that it should have as a basis a theme calculated to do good. He wished to send his audiences away morally better than they came. In one sense this was instruction, and in another sense it was not. It was true entertainment.

In the twelve years of our intercourse he wrote me freely and most intimately on his work as dramatist and playwright, and I can say that while he acknowledged the necessity for a money success he never retrograded in search of it. He believed that a "box-office winning" and an artistic success were both possible in the same play—which he proved in "Shore Acres" and "Sag Harbor."

Mr. Herne took his work seriously. He was never flippant about it. He had ideals and was not ashamed of them—he was, indeed, ready to fight for them. That he stumbled and fell short of reaching his ideal did not sour him or discourage

him. When "Margaret Fleming" failed, he said, "I'll write a better play." When "Griffith Davenport" was taken off, he said, "The time will come when this play will be considered one of my best." When he was forced to give up his part in "Sag Harbor" he at once planned to retire to Herne's Oaks and write a better play than either "Shore Acres" or "Margaret Fleming."

I have never known greater courage or more wonder-working pertinacity. He had his moments of black depression, but his resiliency at sixty years of age was a constant marvel to me. He was intellectually young. He seemed of my own age rather than a generation ahead of me. He was also intellectually hospitable to new ideas and capable of boyish enthusiasm; but through all his ups and downs, failures and successes, shifts of scene and confusion of advice, he never lost sight of the kind of drama he wished to produce, which was a sane, unexaggerated, humorous, and tender story of American life.

The fight he made to get "Shore Acres" produced was stern, as I know, for I shared it with him. The editor of *THE ARENA* and I helped to produce "Margaret Fleming," in Chickering Hall, and we suffered sympathetically all that Mr. Herne and his heroic wife went through in their determination to be true to their ideals. The story of those days of discouragement, if told, would set at rest any doubt of Mr. Herne's sincerity. It is a source of pleasure to me to remember that, after being all through those years of struggle, I was present, with Flower, and Enneking, and Hurd, and Chamberlain, on that glorious first night at the Boston Museum when "Shore Acres" began its golden tale of a hundred nights, and telegrams from New York poured in upon Mr. Herne offering "time" that he had almost begged for. This was the beginning of easier times for the author, and, mindful of his growing family, Mr. Herne kept closely to his success for several years. His play "Griffith Davenport" brought him some fame, but no money, and he went back to "Shore Acres." He began to plan other plays, however, and always sought a union of good work with

salable work; and it is this high purpose,—this inner sweetness,—hidden from many of his friends, that will live in his plays. They have faults of style and construction, but their main interest is wholesome and their outcome noble. "Uncle Nat" may be taken to represent the type of life that appealed to Mr. Herne with greatest power as a dramatist. As an actor he loved *all* quaintly humorous, unconsciously self-sacrificing characters—just as in life the cause of a self-immolating reformer like Henry George appealed to him with regenerative power. His humanitarian enthusiasm and his plays "Shore Acres" and "Margaret Fleming" expressed the man as I knew him. He made himself a national force in our drama, and the best of his teaching has already entered into the stage-craft of our day.

HAMLIN GARLAND.

West Salem, Wis.

II. MR. HERNE AS I KNEW HIM.

✓ **W**HEN a noted man passes away who has helped along some great movement in art, literature, or science, the questions always arise: What has he accomplished? What influence has he exerted? Will his work live and be successfully carried forward by others?

The late James A. Herne, who has recently passed from among us, rose to a prominent position among the revolutionary or evolutionary Progressives of the world, not only helping in the reconstruction of the drama—which stood in much need of sincerity, virility, and truth in tendency and expression—but also throwing himself heart and soul into the conflict for the rights of the people.

I for one am satisfied that his influence for good, as stage manager, actor, dramatist, and social economist, will be of permanent value, because he went back to first principles—to Nature—to Truth. At the time when Mr. Herne turned to truth for art's sake, the difficulties confronting him seemed insurmountable. It was almost impossible for him to gain

a hearing, and it required the greatest courage to persevere in a course that seemed to promise nothing but defeat. ✓

I remember that it was about that time that there was considerable discussion going on relative to the establishment of a *theatre libre*, to give opportunity for the introduction to the public of progressive men and their work. Mr. Hamlin Garland, through whom I became acquainted with Mr. and Mrs. Herne some time before they presented "Margaret Fleming" to the Boston public, was very enthusiastic over the proposition to have such an institution brought into existence, because it was so discouragingly difficult to get a fair trial for any play that did not pander to the popular taste. ✓ Mr. Herne often remarked that he envied the painter, because it was easy for the latter to bring his work before the public. In the field of art, competition was yet free and healthy. It must have been disheartening for Wagner to wait eleven years before one of his great productions was performed. Millet during his lifetime was appreciated by a few artists, but not by the public. He died very poor and is hardly yet understood, although his pictures now bring princely prices. Very few great men have lived long enough to enjoy the material fruits of their labor, Turner and Mendelssohn being notable exceptions.

Mr. Herne, although an avowed realist, a grubber for undulterated truth, and a stickler for its objective representation, was impressionistically inclined, and would in time, I believe, have gravitated to idealism and subjective representation. But in this event his work would have been genuine, because this evolution of a playwright from the bondage of stage tradition, conventionalism, and superficialism to almost brutal truth and rigid simplicity is the natural course for him to follow in order to find his true or best self somewhere between the two extremes. The realism of Ibsen, Tolstoi, and Sudermann served to blaze the way for Mr. Herne. Henry George guided him in the way of social justice and economic progress. Hamlin Garland, Mr. Howells, and others were stanch friends and were likewise making for the same goal; but from no one did Mr. Herne receive so much inspiration, sympathy, and help as

from his devoted and accomplished wife, Katherine Herne, who ever understood and encouraged him.

His "Drifting Apart" and "Margaret Fleming" are powerful sermons. "Shore Acres" represents the heart life of the people. "Griffith Davenport" is a grand summing up of a great national struggle and gives almost a complete impression of the great Rebellion. This last great effort gave me (as an artist) the highest opinion of him, not only as an actor and a playwright but as a great artist and a strong man. In the field of painting such men are not always at once appreciated, any more than in the dramatic world. Thus Hunt, George Fuller Innis, Homer Martin, and many others have had to die to be recognized at their true value.

Mr. Herne when in Boston found his way into my studio frequently. He as well as his wife loved pictures, and were especially interested in all representations of Nature that were honest, individual, and truthful. When I first knew the actor he was almost too rabid a realist for me, and we had some spirited talks on the subject. I remember one of these discussions, when Mr. Howells and Hamlin Garland were also present. Either Herne or Garland insisted that I was a realist, because pictures standing around proclaimed me as such. I promptly denied the charge and insisted that what he designated as pictures were only careful studies. Some one then said, "If you are not a realist, what do you call yourself?" I replied, "I do not know what I am, but I try to be an unadulterated individual."

In the course of the conversation either Mr. Herne or Mr. Howells asked my definition of the real and the ideal. On the spur of the moment I said, "The ideal is the choicest expression of the real;" whereupon Mr. Howells said, "Good!—that is the shortest definition on record." Mr. Herne also liked the definition, saying that it exactly voiced his sentiments.

The death of Mr. Herne is a grievous loss to his family and a great loss to the world.

J. J. ENNEKING.

Boston, Mass.

III. THE MAN AND HIS WORK.

I.

IN some respects the life of the late James A. Herne is unique. The eminent playwright, the delightful actor, and consummate stage manager rose to distinction and wrought effectively for a wholesome American drama in spite of adverse environments in early years and the temptation of gold, ease, and ephemeral popularity later in his career. Thus he proved himself superior to the most baleful and seductive three influences of modern life. He was remarkable also in that, after an early career that counted for little in the work achieved, he awakened to a keen sense of the deeper meaning of art and manhood and became an earnest, aggressive, and constructive worker in artistic, literary, and social fields at a time when most persons become set, conservative, sluggish, and not infrequently indifferent and pessimistic. Like William Morris, who spent the early part of his brilliant literary career as "the idle singer of an empty day," but who later came under the compelling influence of the pending social revolution to such a degree that he became beyond all else an apostle of justice and human progress, so James A. Herne, after a varied career on the stage, as actor, stage director, and manager, married a woman of superior ability, both as an artist and a thinker; next he won a fortune in a conventional melodrama and was in a fair way to become immensely rich by catering to the tastes of those who care only for cheap amusement. Then, however, he came under the influence of the threefold revolution that marked the closing half of the nineteenth century—the evolutionary theory as expounded by Herbert Spencer, the revolt against artificiality in literature and art as led by Tolstoi, Ibsen, Sudermann, and Mr. Howells, and the social gospel as proclaimed by Henry George. These influences awakened all that was best in his being, quickening his emotional nature on its higher planes of expression. The effect was astonishing to those who had known the man in earlier days. He determined to devote the remainder of his life to serious and true

American dramatic work, and with this resolution formed he steadily refused to surrender what he conceived to be the true demand of dramatic art, though sorely tempted by wealth to be easily gained by ephemeral productions. For many years he was a student of Tolstoi, Sudermann, Ibsen, and other great veritists in literature, while the social philosophy of Henry George won his whole-hearted acceptance. In it he believed there was to be found social salvation with freedom, and to almost the day of his death he was ever ready to give his services freely for the cause of the single tax. His addresses were clear, popular, sincere, and convincing, and he contributed a magnificent service to the cause of social progress by his faithful work in this direction.

II.

Mr. Herne was worth about one hundred thousand dollars when he was overmastered by the light and determined to consecrate the remainder of his artistic career to the cause of truth in the field of dramatic expression. His "Hearts of Oak," a conventional melodrama, was phenomenally popular, but he determined on the creation of plays that should be at once serious, thoughtful, and true. His first drama in this direction was "Drifting Apart," probably the most powerful temperance sermon ever produced on the boards of a theater. It proved a financial failure, as did "The Minute Men," a pioneer Revolutionary study, though this latter was far stronger, finer, and more artistic than many recent dramatic successes among war plays. It was not difficult to understand the cause of these failures. Mr. Herne had for years been playing to audiences that demanded an exciting melodrama, filled with mock heroics, dramatic clap-trap, and spectacular effects that delighted the galleries. With his large following the new plays fell flat. The actor was speaking to them in an unknown tongue. There were in the cities in which he played thousands of persons who would have greatly enjoyed "Drifting Apart" and "The Minute Men," but few of these people had ever seen Mr. Herne, as the conventional melodrama had

little attraction for them. Hence he disappointed his old friends and had not as yet found an appreciative new audience.

A man less resolute would have given up the struggle when poverty stared him in the face, and, adopting the unworthy but popular cry of the modern commercial world, would have exclaimed, Since the people do not want good plays I will give them what they want!—and thereby become again independent. Had his home influence favored such a course, it is possible that he might have returned to the conventional, barn-storming melodramas, but in his high resolve to be true to the vital ideal, "art for progress, the beautiful useful," he was warmly seconded by his accomplished wife. Katherine Herne had entered heart and soul into the higher and broader conception of being which had so revolutionized her husband's work. Together they had studied and heartily accepted the vision of justice unfolded in the social gospel of Henry George. They had perused with delight the masterly exposition of evolution as given by the great philosophic thinkers who have made the nineteenth century forever memorable; while the rugged protests against the unreal, the artificial, and the hollow hypocrisy of a conventional literature and art by vigorous Russian, Scandinavian, and German thinkers awakened their enthusiasm and proved a positive inspiration. And now, when standing in the shadow of defeat, with fortune vanished and poverty present, Mrs. Herne courageously and steadfastly encouraged her husband to persevere.

It was during these trying years of adversity that Mr. Herne wrote "Margaret Fleming," which I think is by far his greatest dramatic creation, as it is also the most powerful protest against the double standard of morals to be found in our dramatic literature. But, fine as was the play, it was too unconventional for managers. Mr. Herne could find no means of bringing it before the public. It was at this time that Hamlin Garland, Mr. J. Henry Wiggin, and a few other friends interested themselves in the production, with the result that it was enacted for about two weeks at Chickering Hall, in Boston, Mr. and Mrs. Herne assuming the leading rôles, supported by a care-

fully selected company. The presentation, however, lacked the advantage of scenic effect and other auxiliary aids, but the essential greatness of the play was felt by all the more serious in the audiences. The critics, even those who championed the conventional drama, acknowledged its power and worth.

It was this production that introduced Mr. Herne to the thoughtful public and also acquainted managers with the worth of his new work. Mr. William Dean Howells further aided the actor with some fine criticisms and by a letter to Mr. Field, of the Museum, at the time the latter was debating whether or not to accept "Shore Acres," a simple and true play of New England life which the actor had written after the completion of "Margaret Fleming." Finally Mr. Field decided to give the new play a trial. It did not prove instantaneously successful, and toward the close of the second week I remember Mr. Herne's calling at my office in a rather despondent mood. He told me that Mr. Field did not consider the play a success and was talking of taking it off at the close of the next week, and the fact that the audiences were slowly increasing did not seem to convince the skeptical manager of the value of "Shore Acres"; but by the end of the third week the play was drawing fine houses, and thenceforth to the close of the season—a period of about one hundred nights—it was a reigning success. From that time, barring the financially unfortunate venture attending the production of "Griffith Davenport," Mr. Herne enjoyed the pleasures and comforts of prosperity.

III.

Perhaps no man with noble ideals and high aspirations at all times reaches the standard that floats as a pillar of fire before the soul, and Mr. Herne, in common with others, did not at all times, even in his later years, reach his ideals. This fact he expressed to me in a letter written less than two years ago. I had given my impressions of the actor-dramatist as I knew him, in a magazine article, and Mr. Herne, who was a man of few words, wrote me in regard to this paper. "You have," he said, "given me more than I deserve. I only wish that

I were all that you say of me, and what you have said is exactly what I wish to be." In my paper I had merely given the impressions of the man that I had received from seeing him in his home, from conversations with him, and from a study of his great characters; for in a man's master creations there is ever shadowed forth much of his own nature as well as his best aspirations.

It is a fact worthy to be mentioned in passing that nowhere was Mr. Herne so passionately loved as in his own family. He was almost idolized by wife and children, while his services to the cause of the American drama have during recent years been recognized by the most eminent and competent critics on both sides of the Atlantic. In his recent work on the American stage, the very able dramatic authority, Mr. Norman Hapgood, pays the following tribute to the work of Mr. Herne for the American drama:

"Two men stand out, as far as we may see, clearly ahead of their predecessors—James A. Herne for intellectual quality supported by considerable stagecraft, and William Gillette for the playwright talent, working on ideas of his own. Their plays are equaled by single efforts of other men, but no other American dramatist has done so much of equal merit."

Mr. Herne's loyalty to truth in art and his desire to make the drama a potent factor in present-day life—a real educator, as well as a true reflector of life and the aspirations of the age—were tested in the furnace of adversity to such a degree that it revealed the presence of that high, true spirit that in every age has marked the men and women who have carried forward whatsoever is best in religion, in science, in art, and in life, in spite of a mockingly indifferent and often openly hostile conventionalism.

B. O. FLOWER.

Boston, Mass.

THE SINGLE TAX AS A HAPPY MEDIUM.

IN the rush of events amidst which we live, it is not strange that there should be an almost infinite variety of opinions as to the relative importance of these events, as to their causes and consequences, and also as to the best means to be used to strengthen and perpetuate the good tendencies and to modify or destroy the evil ones.

When the tax lists are prepared, and we learn what we must pay in this way for the advantages of association, we are very apt to feel that the community is encroaching on our rights, and we proclaim the doctrines of Individualism as those which are to bring the millennium through their observance; but when our house burns or is looted by burglars, and the fire department or the police fail to protect us, we become convinced that Socialism, which shall prevent any loss or avoidable discomfort from coming to us, is that of which the prophets and seers have sung in their portrayals of the heavenly estate. This, in brief, suggests the two directions in which the thought and effort of the day are being exerted.

Individualism and Socialism—manifested in many ways and through endless applications—are the two conflicting ideas of the time; and each, or either, if followed to its legitimate end, will win for its votary the name of “crank,” if not of criminal. Each is a name to conjure with, if you would fill with palpitating dread the breast of the well-to-do and the comfortable, or rouse to a frenzy of rage the down-trodden or the impetuous, or would you fire with holy zeal the heart of the humanitarian, burdened with the sense of others’ wrongs and panting with the desire to help and to rescue. For, as Socialism suggests Paris after the close of the Franco-Prussian war, it also speaks of William Morris, John Ruskin, and other benefactors of the race. As Individualism may suggest Bresci, who so recently robbed the Italian people of a beloved king, it also

brings to mind many a martyr to the cause of humanity. If, then, each has much good to its credit, and each has wrought much harm—since either, logically extended, will destroy the other, its good results as its evil—does it not follow that there must be an intermediate ground or base of action, which shall conserve the good of both while avoiding the evils of both? Is there not, in fact, a “happy medium”? That we may, if possible, discover this medium, let us see what, if any, are the points in common between the Individualist and the Socialist.

A little reflection will show, I believe, that each is seeking that “life, liberty, and happiness” of which our fathers thought when they gave us the Declaration of Independence. The Socialist would gain his object by so controlling all that no one shall be able to oppress another; that is, he would take from all the power to injure any one. The Individualist would remove all restrictions directly from each individual, making even the association with others subject only to the will of the one. That is, he would make the individual so strong as to have no fear even of all others. But, seek it as he may, each is striving after liberty. How is it, then, when so many are striving after liberty—so many that the quest may be said to be wellnigh universal—that so few gain even an approximation to what they seek?

It cannot be that liberty is but a name—a condition about which to theorize or dream, but too elusive and unreal to be attained by humanity. It must be, then, either that our conceptions of liberty are false, in part or in whole, or else our methods of striving after it are ill-adapted to its attainment.

Let us first consider, for a moment, what we commonly *mean* by liberty; then, perhaps, what *real* liberty is. In doing this we will find that the idea of liberty held by all some of the time, and I fear held by some of us all of the time, is a state in which we can do as we please absolutely, without let or hindrance, and can have at any moment, and practically without effort, just whatever the whim of the moment leads us to fancy. But we know perfectly well that Nature's laws, to say nothing of these laws of right and wrong, which we more

commonly call God's laws, will not permit of such a state. "If a man will not work, neither shall he eat." "The effect must be preceded by the adequate cause." These are laws that must be reckoned with.

Again, liberty is the right of all—of each equally with every other, but no further. Clearly, then, it is limited for each just at the point where it would infringe on the liberty of another.

Is not true liberty the absolute and complete ownership of the individual by himself? Let us consider what such ownership means or involves. If I own myself completely, it follows that no one has any claim upon me; and if not upon me, then not upon anything which I may create or produce, save only as I may freely give or barter such a claim. But there is a corollary to this statement of which we must not lose sight; namely, I have no claim upon any other individual, or the productions of any other, save as such claim may be freely bestowed as a gift or as consideration in a voluntary barter.

If you have no claim upon me, and each other individual in the universe has no claim upon me, it follows that no community or assemblage of individuals can have any claim upon me; just as you may string ciphers together until you have encircled the globe, and yet will express no value. But, if I have no claim upon you and you have no claim upon me, there is one direction in which we both have a claim, and that is our claim upon the natural resources, not produced by any individual or body of individuals, but by God, who is the Creator of us all, and who has provided them as a necessary source from which by our own individual efforts we shall each provide for our own life and happiness.

So far we are clearly Individualist; but let us now see what there is from the Socialist side. As an Individualist, I must, to be consistent, provide entirely for myself—I must be a shoemaker, farmer, weaver, miller, tanner, carpenter, baker, etc., all in one and for one. But we learned long ago that this is an impossibility; that one can bake and another make shoes, and that both, or all, are vastly better served if each does what he can do best and each exchanges products with those who

do other things better. To do this, however, successfully, we must be near one another; and so we gather into communities, and with communities come new requirements.

If I cross a field, even in wet weather, the sod is not injured, and it holds me out of the mud; but if a thousand pass and repass in the same day the path becomes a quagmire, and we must have roads and walks, to say nothing of drains and sewers. We must also have provision in the way of police, etc., to see that all this is kept in repair and that every one gets equal use of these improvements; and so association grows until we have our cities, States, and nations.

Two questions now arise: To whom do these improvements belong? and who is to pay for them? For the first: Did you or I create them? No. Then neither you nor I have title to them. But, as the community created them, title is vested in the community; and in the community will be vested the title to all things and all values created by it. To the second question the answer is easy. Improvements made for the community are to be paid for by the community; improvements made by the community are to be paid for to the community—by those who are benefited thereby.

Here, then, are the occasion and justification for what we commonly call taxes. It is the right of the community to demand pay from its beneficiaries to the amount of their benefits and the necessity for the community to have that wherewith to pay for benefits conferred upon the community. But we saw that the community has no right to your goods or mine, or to any part of them, except in return for services rendered. It follows that the community, like the individual, must take of what it has itself produced to pay for what it received; and, clearly, the value of the land produced by the gathering of the community, which makes land in its vicinity more desirable than that at a distance, is produced by the community and not by the individual. It is, then, the property of the community, not of the individual, and is a source from which to derive the means to pay for the benefits bestowed upon the community—hence for which the community is responsible.

Another value belongs to the community, and is available for the satisfaction of its obligations, and that is the excess in value of one piece of land over another, either because of mineral wealth, fertility, or other features that make one more desirable than another. This is so, because of the equal right of all to all of God's gifts to the race. For, since it is a law of Nature that two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time, it follows that some in seeking their share of the Father's bounty will get more favorable locations than others. But it would be no better, if they were ousted, to give place to others, and rotation in possession would be impracticable and at best a poor corrective. Yet it is still true that all have equal claim; so let the favored one pay to the community—that is, to all—the excess of what his favorable location will enable him to produce over that which his less favored neighbor can produce with equal labor. This is the way, and the only way, to equalize opportunity: that is, to give liberty to all. And this is the Single Tax, the "happy medium" between Individualism and Socialism, which leaves—say, rather, which makes—the individual free, yet which gives to the community all the improvements and advantages that can be conceived of.

It is doubtless true that, under this rule, large fortunes will disappear; but is this not as it should be? Where all are equal in the sight of God, should there be such disparity in the sight of men? And, with greater wealth for the few, bitter, pinching, abject poverty for the many shall also pass away; and with both shall go the peculiar sins alike of the poor and the rich.

It is often said that the great middle class is the bulwark of the nation; but by this plan all will be middle class, all will be bulwarks, while at the same time there will be none left to assail—none to overturn the freedom of all.

That this idea is gaining support cannot be doubted. But let us not forget that Truth and Liberty are of universal application. They are not for the seventy or eighty millions of us in the United States, nor for the greater number of English-speaking people, nor for the still greater number of so-called

Christian people, and not for the millions of Africa, Asia, and the islands of the sea—for all come from the same creative hand. All are dependent on God's bounty. We all are brethren.

Let us, then, be in earnest in our quest for liberty—more earnest than ever before; but, understanding what liberty is, let us cease to seek it each for himself, or for his own immediate family, or even for his own nation—for such seeking must ever fall short of attaining its object. Let us rather, in the light of a fuller, nobler conception, strive to attain liberty for all, guarding even more carefully against acts of oppression and injustice from ourselves and ours than we do against encroachment on our rights; and thus, each individual setting himself right, we shall awake to find all free, all enjoying liberty, absolute and complete—for none will be left to act as oppressors.

This is the end sought by the Single Taxer.

W. A. HAWLEY.

Pittsburg, Pa.

LAW AND LIBERTY.

IT is not easy to discover that any nation, ancient or modern, has ever recognized any distinct and well-defined sphere within which the operations of government and legislation ought to be confined. About the only limitation ever generally recognized by governments has been the extreme limit of tolerance of a patient and long-suffering people. Within that necessary limit, human government has been supreme, absolute, and arbitrary, whether exercised by the will of a monarchy, an aristocracy, or a democracy.

The odious dogma of the "divine right of kings" has from time to time been displaced by the scarcely less odious and dangerous dogma of the *divine right of majorities*. Nothing was held sacred to the individual man from the burdens and exactions of legislative authority until the Declaration of Independence promulgated the bold and startling proposition that man has certain *inalienable* rights, including "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."* The Declaration, though somewhat vague and altogether inadequate in defining the zone of *inalienable* rights, served to fix in the public conscience the great moral conviction that there is such a zone of forbidden ground round about the individual upon which no government may rightfully intrude; that, somewhere, there is a line at which the individual may say to all human authority, "Thus far, and no farther."

That conviction has been the vital principle and saving factor in our national life. But it yet remains for the common sense of the people clearly to apprehend and accept the great principles and maxims that will serve as monuments to mark so distinctly that "he who runs may read" the boundary-line of rightful government and legislation. In fact the

* This is not said in forgetfulness of the Magna Charta. That instrument limited the royal prerogatives, but without the remotest thought of limiting the legislative power of the English Government.

notion is all too prevalent that any measure of governmental policy and legislation is legitimate and right if it be the will of "the majority." The physical force of a majority is undeniable, but unlimited right to govern can safely be conceded only to infallibility. The majority of the American people have often been wrong, though never intentionally wrong. When the people shall have arrived at a common acceptation of the principles that mark the limits of rightful legislation they may be relied upon never to transgress those limits; and herein is grounded our hope of the future.

The dogma of the divine right of majorities arises from a tendency to ignore or depreciate the individual man in his relation to society. But the axiom of physics that the whole is greater than any of its parts has no relevancy to intelligence and morals. It is not true of man in his relation to society, except in a physical sense.

Religion assures us that man is made in the image of God; that dominion over the earth was given to him, and that he is immortal. But, independent of divine revelation, we know that man existed prior to society. Society never constructed a man, but men have constructed society; man is real, society is artificial; man is a person, society a thing; and it is reasonably certain that society was made for man, not man for society. Man is in himself a distinct personality, a moral agent, endowed with a soul to aspire, a mind to conceive and plan, and a will to execute. He is, in all the infinite universe, an independent entity—by nature absolutely free to wish, to choose, and to act at will, without control, without restraint, subject to no authority, bound by no law, confined only by the limitations of pain and death. All beings beneath man in the order of creation remain from generation to generation unchanged in desires and habits of life, bound by the inflexible chains of instinct. Man alone, though possessed of instincts, is independent of them; he may rise above or sink beneath them at will. Man alone possesses within himself the power to violate the laws of God, of Nature, and of his own being. And therein consists the majesty and glory of manhood: free as

God, sole possessor and ruler of himself, and responsible to himself. It could not be otherwise without deposing man, the person, and reducing him to a mere "thing." It is moral agency—absolute independence of will and freedom of action—that makes evolution and growth of human character and virtue possible; without it such progress would be impossible. By completely subjugating the will and action of a man to the absolute control of another in all things you destroy him as a person. Partially to subjugate and control him is, *pro tanto*, partially to destroy him. Here we have a truth, immovably fixed in the essential nature of man, reducible to this maxim: *individual liberty is essential to individual character and virtue.*

As society is made by and composed of the individuals who are its members, it is certain that the character and virtue of society are always relative to the general character and virtue of its members. Nations are organized society, and governments are the instruments by which the power of nations is exercised. The well-being of society, the vitality of nations, the efficacy of governments depend upon the intellectual and moral stature of the individual citizen. It is the individual who elevates society. Society cannot elevate the individual. Man as an individual began, a naked savage without knowledge and without law, to elevate himself; and it was only after achieving measurable success that he was able to begin the construction and upbuilding of a civilized society. The progress he has been able to make has always been proportionate to his freedom from external restraint and control. Given perfect liberty of thought and action, he will regenerate himself and the world. His natural tendency is upward; he never deteriorates except when his will is checked and his life forced into a groove marked out for him by others. As he deteriorates, the society of which he is a member deteriorates proportionately. Here is another fixed truth that may be compressed into a simple maxim: *national character and virtue depend upon the character and virtue of the individual citizen.*

Man is ever striving after better things and setting before

himself higher ideals. Exceptional cases of depravity, however frequent, only serve to prove the rule by the abhorrence and condemnation with which they are regarded by mankind in general. History is a record of the struggles of man for the achievement of higher ideals. There have been bright periods, when human genius has risen to sublime heights, and dark periods, when the whole race seemed hopelessly doomed in the degradation of ignorance, superstition, and vice; but the bright periods were always coincident with an unusual degree of personal liberty, and the darkness prevailed when the individual was bowed down under the weight of human authority. At every relaxation of its heavy hand the aspiring genius of man has mounted upward. The yearning of the human heart is for that which is right. The universal desire of all men is for absolute personal independence and liberty, but the great majority of mankind are well disposed toward their fellow-men and willing to allow to others the rights they desire for themselves. It is this fact that makes civilized society and government possible. It is a safe maxim that *mankind in general are disposed to do right.*

But the fact that there are, at all times, exceptions to this rule is the overshadowing misfortune of the world. Some men are not well disposed, but, when they have sufficient power, will violate the rights of others. It is this fact that makes human governments necessary. While all men desire absolute liberty, none but the strongest could realize that desire but for the restraining hand of law. Governments are instituted *solely* because some men will injure their fellows, and the common desire of all men for perfect liberty cannot be measurably gratified without the common safeguard of law. Upon no other pretext whatever can any assumption of authority by man over man be justified or excused. But for the fact that some men will injure others, no human government would ever have been established or tolerated; for, if the desire of all men for perfect liberty were already fulfilled and secure from all external restraints and perils, no man would ever either aspire or submit to authority. *The authority of the parent over

the child is no exception. The child is not a responsible moral agent, and it is not only a natural right but a moral duty of the parent to direct and control the child until it arrives at years of discretion. But no man, no class of men, no majority however overwhelming, can reasonably pretend to a natural right or moral duty to exercise parental or paternal authority over any man who is a moral agent. Any attempt to do so is an invasion of personal liberty, a meddlesome interference with human life and destiny, and a profanation of all that is divine and sacred in man. Even the Creator holds the independent will of man sacred from the control of Omnipotence. It ought to be a universally accepted maxim that *government derives its right to exist and to exercise authority from the necessity of restraining those who would injure others.*

Absolute liberty includes the natural privilege to do, or to abstain from doing, anything dictated by the will, whether good or evil, right or wrong. But it is clear that the fullest measure of liberty that it is possible for all men to enjoy at the same time without conflict must necessarily include all those acts and omissions that do not injuriously affect others, and must exclude all acts and omissions that will injure others: the former is the sacred domain of liberty, the latter is the rightful domain of law. Natural liberty is as boundless as the range of human thought and the desires of the human heart, whether consistent or not with the liberty of others. The zone of inalienable rights, sacred to the individual, within which no government may rightfully intrude, comprises all of natural liberty up to the line of conflict with the rights of others; and there it ends. At that line the rightful authority of government begins and holds dominion over the common ground of conflict between natural liberty and the rights of others. That is the line at which the individual may meet all assertions of human authority with the warning, "Thus far, and no farther." The end of government is to guard and defend individual liberty, not to intrude upon or destroy it.

When this conception of the limitation of just government shall have received the common assent of mankind, as the

supreme standard by which all legislation shall be judged, a considerable number of familiar laws will stand condemned; but the solution of the economic and political problems that threaten the peace and security of society will be simplified. The common acceptance of some such definite standard is necessary, as a safeguard not only against aggressions of power and ambition, but also against the benevolent but dangerous experiments of State Socialism.

The centralization of wealth and diffusion of poverty and dependence; the growth of corporate power and greed that is absorbing the fruits of labor, monopolizing and driving common individuals out of all the avenues of human effort, industry, and enterprise, and reducing the great majority of the people to the precarious and slavish condition of wage-workers, totally dependent upon the charity, fortunes, caprice, and disasters of the corporations that employ them—these things are the product of legislation and policies that transcend the limitations of just government.

Remedies should not be sought in the making of more laws, nor in making more experiments still further departing from the rightful domain of government. Remove from the path of individual life and liberty all meddlesome legislation that creates false conditions, narrows the opportunity and cripples the power of the individual, and the genius of man will peacefully, justly, and rapidly rise superior to all the evils that have come upon him, and with him society will rise to a higher and more secure state than ever before.

"Civilization" and "progress" are much abused terms. It is not civilization that degrades the many while it elevates the few. It is not progress that narrows the opportunities of and impoverishes the common people, while multiplying the aggregate wealth of the world. Civilization is measured by the moral elevation of the common people. Material progress is measured by the pecuniary independence of the common people and their opportunity for self-directed enterprise.

FRANK EXLINE.

Geddes, S. D.

THE CRIMINAL NEGRO.

VII. CHILDHOOD INFLUENCES.

THE remainder of the investigation presents the environmental conditions under which Southern negro criminals are reared. The cases already described are typical of the whole class. These results are more trustworthy than similar ones obtained from Northern white criminals. The coöperation of both officers and convicts was most earnest, and the small communities from which the criminals came made it easy to trace the influences in families and among associates.

From data gathered from prison populations aggregating nearly 10,000 and from minute observation of those measured, the evidence is clear that the negro criminal class is not an educated one. The ninety subjects measured were selected from about 300 women. Illiterate subjects were accepted only when others were not obtainable. From 42 offenders against the person, it was necessary to use 11 who were illiterate; of the remainder, 16 had attended country school, the average attendance being 3.7 years of about 3 months each—about one year of Northern training. In quality of education there is no comparison. Out of this number, 15 had attended city schools, the average attendance being 5.6 years. Thus the advantages in the city are greater. The education of the parents shows that in 7 cases both parents were illiterate; the fathers in 13 cases were illiterate, and in 21 cases had received some education, and 8 were unascertainable; of the mothers, 22 were illiterate, 14 had received some education, and 6 were unascertainable. The reasons given for leaving school at an early age included such as—work, 8; marriage, 4; moved away, 3; epilepsy and illness, 4 each. "Ran away from home," "got tired," and "didn't like it" were common reasons. The most favorable ages for attending school were, in order, 7-9, 9-11, and 11-13, only a very small number being in the last class.

The facts for offenders against property are slightly different. It is of interest to consider these separately, for this class is largely from the city districts and shows the superior advantages there. Out of 38, only 7 were illiterate and only 8 had also attended country schools. The average period of attendance was 4.4 years. The education of the parents was better than that of the class previously given. If a prison population possesses no higher average of education than this, and the parents are in a position to bequeath so little knowledge and educational culture to the children, there can be but little foundation for the assertions that the education of the negro does not decrease crime. Certainly the educated negroes are not found in the prisons, unless illiteracy and ability merely to read and write constitute these.

The methods used by parents in teaching right and wrong are of interest because they reveal something of the moral standards. Both persuasion and punishment were used, but the latter exceeded the former by a great majority. A number of the subjects declared they were not taught differences between right and wrong. They were punished for fighting, stealing, dipping snuff, lying, wanting others' things, card playing, dancing, or drinking. There is little or no evidence of the finer moral discriminations, and the method is training through punishment rather than through wise direction which avoids punishment. Restraints are shown in a few instances where parents objected to visits to saloons, dance-houses, etc. As among children who have been sent to Northern reformatories, the presence of stepfathers and stepmothers was often made evident by harsh and unusual punishments and by the children leaving home at an early age. Where the negroes had been brought up by whites, the training was generally lax. The punishments included: whipping with switch or strap, 62; sent to bed without food, 33; dark room, 31; locked up, 9; slapped (frequently), 9; tied up, 4; kneeling, 4. Other punishments were: head tied in a sack, standing on boxes, no food or water, frightened, holding bricks, silence, arms tied up, clothes tied over their heads, and kneeling on cracked

bricks or shelled corn. The punishment does not lack in severity but in certainty. It is usually administered spasmodically and during anger. Often the amount of injury caused by the child's act regulates the degree of punishment, as does also the amount of shock to the parents' feelings. To illustrate the latter, if a child falls into a few inches of water and soils its clothes it may receive a moderate punishment, but if the mother is frightened because it has been in danger of drowning it may receive a more severe one. Spasmodic, unsystematic, unsympathetic, and often unprincipled discipline is the practise.

The object in securing the number of books read was to determine to what use the education had been put, and if any educational influences existed outside the schoolroom. The results show: Bible, 37; none, 27; novels, 22; Sunday-school books, 11; juvenile, history, and newspapers, 6 each; biographies, schoolbooks (as readers), and religious papers, 5 each; poems, 2; magazines, 1. One-third of the number had never read anything, and only 1 could describe a magazine clearly. The prominence of the Bible is of course due to the fact that it is often the only book owned, or obtainable. While its value is not questioned, the absence of every other kind of literature must often make it misunderstood, or lead to a narrow application of its precepts. Biographies and history were respectively those of Washington and Lincoln and of the United States. The preferences in reading show that the Bible was in favor with more than one-half. This is inaccurate for two reasons: many had no other literature from which to choose, and others thought, as a matter of duty, they should prefer it. The range of reading was so limited that but little preference could be expressed. In choice, George Washington was a close second to Jesse James, while Diamond Dick and Nick Carter won over all other dime novel heroes. Mrs. Holmes and Augusta Evans were the popular novelists, and "Mother Goose" and "Peck's Bad Boy" represented the juvenile reading. There are no opportunities for obtaining reading matter in the prisons or in the country districts, and only limited ones in the cities.

The number of children in a family throws light upon the

problem of crime, because in a crude way it reveals the probable chance of each child for training and care. A farmer with a small section of plantation can do better for one child than for ten. Food, clothing, and *individual* training and opportunities become more limited as the numbers increase. The number of children in the families from which these criminals came ranges from one to twenty-seven. The average is eight per family. It becomes apparent, then, that some of these children must enter the labor ranks at an early age. The chances for individual training were small because the mother was also a laborer on the plantation. This statement is based upon the supposition that both parents are living, but the results show that before they had reached the age of 15 (the estimated age at which a girl still needs parental care) 30 had lost their fathers and 29 their mothers, and in 6 instances both parents had died. This means that in nearly two-thirds of the cases there had been step-parents, and the girls had married or they had been forced into the world to work for themselves, and often for younger brothers and sisters. In case of death there is rarely any provision made for the family, the benefits of insurance and the millions of small savings in the North being unknown among the mass of negroes.

The greater number of subjects claimed occupations as follows: nurses, 21; servants, 15; cooks, 14; field hands, 12; laundresses, 9; none, 5; factory and dining-room employees, each 2. Sixteen had been taught dressmaking, and 9 followed it. In many cases immorality was preferred to these trades, because of low wages or inability to secure work. The wage-rate is lower for negroes than for whites, and upon many plantations there is no regular price paid—exchange and barter still being resorted to. The average age at which they began work was 12.5 years, but there are a few instances where they have begun as nurse girls at ages ranging from 6 to 10 years. Without exception they belonged to the laboring classes.

There is one other interesting factor in the influences in the childhood of these criminals—the nature of their play. This was almost entirely out-of-doors and their games were of a

social nature, which means removal from parental restraints. Where numbers of children play together, careful supervision is needed to prevent the acquirement of bad habits and selection of bad associates. The games were: dolls, 66; hide-and-seek, 49; ball, 39; jump-the-rope, 39; see-saw, 39; jack-stones, 21; marbles, 19; ring games, 11; croquet, 10; swing and craps, 9 each; poison, 7; cards, housekeeping, and running games, 6 each. Mumbletepeg, hockey, kites, leap-frog, tops, hoops, etc., had each one or two adherents. There were but few toys used, and the games were simple, involving no complicated elements or apparatus. "Hide switches" is a game peculiarly their own, as is also "poison." Little or no use is made of play to develop such qualities as tolerance, self-control, patience, and unselfishness, except as the children teach one another.

For the childhood of these children, who have become criminals, there are found: defective education, meager moral instruction, little or no reading, unfavorable conditions (as related to home training and opportunities), harsh punishments, restriction to the laboring classes, and unrestrained and undirected recreation. This being true, what influences are found in the adult life of these same criminals that may counteract these early ones?

The recreation in adult life was divided into drama, music, and art. The horizon was so narrowed that it was difficult to secure results, but they represent fairly the conditions. Two preferences were allowed each subject, in order that the results might be more trustworthy, and they are here grouped together. The kinds of recreation preferred were: church festivals, 36; picnics, 18; shows, 13; excursions, 13; fairs, 10; "never went anywhere," 4; concerts and dances, 3 each. Some of the reasons given were: "have fun and enjoyment," "likes church doin's 'cause are better places," and "more quieter." In drama they gave their preferences in the form of "likes sad parts best," or "likes funny parts most." In attempting to secure more definite facts the following resulted: 46 admitted that they had seen no plays, 8 liked minstrels, and 4 had seen

circuses. Some of the plays seen were: "Ten Nights in a Bar-room," 3; "Monte Cristo," "Devil's Auction," and "Two Orphans," 2 each; and "White Salve," "Skipped by the Light of the Moon," and a dog-show, 1 each.

The field of music was more familiar to them. The results were: church music, 58; instrumental, 32; band, 20; love-songs, 13; string instruments, 10. Art was dubious ground again, for 28 preferred pictures—like photographs, crayons, etc.; Biblical pictures, 25; paintings, 16; pictures of Nature, 6; decorations, 4. Pictures of people, buildings, in wax and in hair, were also mentioned. Art meant to them "all pretty things," and in this they included a great array of bright colors, varied designs and decorations, and articles used in domestic art. It is seen that the bulk of their social life centers in the church, the incentive being a desire for a "good time." Their music is for pastime, and is not a cultural influence; drama is almost unknown, and their taste in art is similar to that of primitive tribes. The kind of associates is also of importance. It was necessary to explain carefully what was meant by good and bad associates. Forty-seven believed their associates were bad and 32 that they were good. Results were unobtainable for the remainder. Forty-nine were decidedly in favor of "social times," 14 were semi-enthusiastic, and 11 were not sure if it was a "good thing."

The kind of temptations is a question naturally related to the associates. The results are much at variance with the actual facts, for it was difficult to make them understand the nature and scope of the question. They believed, for instance, that temptations were only such *when yielded to*. Twenty-two of the records were considered unreliable and were set aside. In the remainder, only grave temptations were given, such as immorality, use of alcohol, stealing, dancing, carousals, and fighting. They placed no emphasis upon the smaller temptations. The habits reveal, more clearly than do the temptations, the moral standards. These numbers are undoubtedly too small, as a few of the criminals would not openly admit their bad habits: immoral, 45; swearing, 38; smoking and use of

snuff, 32 each; alcohol and chewing tobacco, 23 each; morphine, 5. Some of them had as many as five of these habits—and the average was over two each. Some of the ways in which they were acquired were: in prison, 11; tobacco for toothache, 5; taught by relatives, 4; bad example, through illness, and at school, 3 each. Other answers were: "on the farm," "in bad company," "own desire," and "always had them." Tobacco is furnished all convicts in the South, so there is a constant temptation to use it.

Facts for recidivism were unsatisfactory. Only one-seventh admitted having been previously arrested, and of these two-thirds were offenders against property. For the offenses against person the penalties were so severe that there had been but small opportunity for a repetition of the offense. This throws but little light upon the question of habitual criminality.

The habits of the parents included such as: For the fathers—smoking, 36; chewing tobacco, 35; alcohol, 19; gambling, 7. For the mothers—smoking and snuff, each 22; chewing tobacco, 8; alcohol, 3. The relatives of 20 others used alcohol, and epilepsy was not infrequent. Morphine is rarely used, and only in the cities; while cocaine is unknown.

From these factors in adult life it appears there was little or no improvement in the environment, and that the results were but the logical outcome of the earlier surroundings.

FRANCES A. KELLOR.

The University of Chicago.

TOPICS OF THE TIMES.

By B. O. FLOWER.

THE SUCCESSFUL MEN OF THE AGES.

It has ever been as it is to-day. The truly successful men—they who mold civilization and elevate humanity, who move the world onward and upward, and who live in the lore of the ages—work in comparative obscurity, or encounter the savage and brutal opposition of Church, State, and conventional society, and their greatness or the measure of their magnificent service is not realized until long after they have passed beyond our vision. Let me illustrate by two or three typical cases out of thousands that might be cited.

Between the years 60 and 66, while Nero, seated on the throne of the Cæsars, was lord of life and death and, commanding unlimited millions, was living a life of luxury, license, and dissipation surrounded by multitudes of flatterers in a city that wildly applauded the brutal spectacles with which he regaled the populace, there was brought before his judgment seat a prisoner who came from far-away Palestine. We can easily imagine that there was little that was attractive in the exterior of the man in bonds, who belonged to a race for whom the Romans entertained supreme contempt. Still less could there be found any bond of sympathy between the ideal worlds in which they lived; for Nero was a typical representative of egoism, surrounded by the majesty of law, clothed in power, and at the summit of what shallow conventionalism would call success, while the prisoner was "a disturber of the peace." Men said of him that he fomented sedition. He had been driven from Ephesus because he had imperiled the trade of certain crafts, for then as now the market was more important to conventional society than manhood and morals. Certainly he antagonized the State religion of the Romans and the habits, customs, and morals of the Imperial City. Moreover, he was a typical altruist. He was dominated by the spiritual nature. On the way to Damascus he had been overmastered by the

Light, and henceforth his life was given, and gladly given, to the cause of all rather than to the interest of self. This man, who awakened the varying emotions of indifference, contempt, scorn, anger, and hatred among the upholders of law and order and the conventionalism of his day, was one of the real leaders of the ages.

A few years elapsed, and the emperor and the prisoner had perished. The egoist had fled from the fury of those over whom he had ruled and died an ignominious death. The altruist probably found a martyr's grave. For two thousand years the name of him who in the year 60 stood as the type of what conventionalism ever labels "success" has awakened no feelings save those of horror, loathing, revulsion, or pity in the mind of normal manhood, while the life, the words, and the work of the obscure prisoner, the "disturber of the peace," have proved an inspiration and an upward lever to millions upon millions of lives. In the light of history, which life, think you, was the more successful? Which man was the true leader?

From Paul to Nero we turn to Epaphroditus and Epictetus. The former was a rich freedman who basked in the favor of Nero. He was a man envied by thousands because of his influence at court. His wealth, power, and popularity doubtless made conventional instructors of that age point to him when teaching the young as a fine example of success, for he had once been a freedman and had now become possessed of all the things that shallow conventionalism esteems most highly. Among the many slaves who thronged the luxurious home of Epaphroditus was a crippled Phrygian named Epictetus. He was a high-minded youth who early came under the influence of the pure philosophy of Stoicism. He renounced the ephemeral pleasures that occupied the egoists, from Nero and Epaphroditus down to the most ignorant of the slaves around him. He chose the path of altruism. He who is overpowered by the "love of the best" cannot remain idle or concerned with self-interest. Henceforth he must seek to brighten and ennoble other lives; and thus we find Epictetus following the path of purity and virtue in the midst of unequaled corruption and guiding others along the pathway of holiness. After the ignominious death of Epaphroditus, who was executed for complicity in the death of Nero, Epictetus gained his freedom and became a teacher of ethics in Rome until Domitian banished the philosophers. Then he went to Epirus, where he long taught his disciples and where he delivered those masterly dis-

courses which have been a positive help to thousands of men and women, and which the noblest of the Roman emperors declared had helped him to a virtuous and just life as had the teachings of no other man save Socrates.

Once again, let us notice two modern lives. During recent years the Anglo-Saxon world has been flooded with biographies of Napoleon Bonaparte. Many of these have been fulsome and unhealthy narratives in which the Corsican has been idealized and held up as a heroic figure. As a matter of fact he was perhaps the best representative of egoism which the nineteenth century presents—a man to whom was given the power to carry forward the democratic ideal to far greater lengths than did Washington, but who, recreant to his great trust, betrayed freedom and the cause of human progress for self-aggrandizement. Through the great and unique power with which he was endowed and the force of circumstances that environed him, he was enabled to rise to the highest pinnacle to which an egoist can mount. After his coronation conventionalism regarded him as one of the most successful men of the ages; yet in a few brief years we find him a lonely exile on a desolate ocean-girt isle—all his dreams of glory vanished, wealth and power fled forevermore—while there follow him to the end the curses of hundreds of thousands of human beings who through him have been robbed of life's dearest treasures.

In less than a score of years after the death of Napoleon on St. Helena an Italian exile might have been seen threading his way through the fog-darkened streets of London. As Napoleon was the typical representative of egoism, Giuseppe Mazzini was a splendid type of altruism. He was a fine scholar, a man of ideals and imagination, who at the sound of duty's voice deliberately turned from the pleasures of a literary life—which strongly attracted him—and accepted imprisonment, exile, and the gravest perils in life for the unity and freedom of his native land. In London he was reduced to the direst poverty, but no thought of self could turn him from the cause. Tirelessly he wrote and worked for true democracy. He was one of the earliest philosophers who fully realized the meaning and implication of the solidarity of the race, and he dedicated his life to the cause of liberty and human happiness. While working unceasingly for Italian unity and liberty, he also established in London a free school in which he taught the very poor children of his countrymen—ever seeking to broaden their intellectual horizon, awaken their spiritual energies, and increase their happiness. Much for which he wrought was

achieved in his lifetime, and when he died, at Pisa, in March, 1872, more than eighty thousand mourners followed his remains to the grave, and his splendid writings are to-day probably influencing and inspiring the apostles of altruism more than at any previous period. That poor exile was one of the world's great leaders, though the conventionalism of his day ignored and scorned when it did not persecute him.

* * *

GREAT INVENTIONS OF THE DAWNING CENTURY AND WHAT THEY PROMISE FOR THE RACE.

I. ACTIVITY IN THE WORLD OF INVENTIVE GENIUS.

Many writers predict that progress through inventions and discoveries for utilizing the forces of Nature in the service of civilization will be far less marked in the twentieth century than it has been during the last hundred years—a period universally regarded as preëminently the age of invention and scientific advance. The opening of the twentieth century, however, reveals an unprecedented activity among inventive geniuses and those who are seeking to utilize the power and wealth of Nature for the benefit of man. Indeed, I think it is not too much to say that the promise of the present years seems to indicate that the great discoveries and inventions of the nineteenth century will prove merely the foundation for still greater works, or at least that the achievements of the past will be splendidly complemented in the near future by discoveries of incalculable potential value to the race. Mr. Edison announces two achievements that will be of immense importance, presuming that the great inventor and those who have been sufficiently in his confidence to speak intelligently are not mistaken in their conclusions.

II. PALACES OF BEAUTY FOR THE MILLIONS.

Mr. Edison has heretofore been a conservative prophet concerning the practical value of his own discoveries. Hence his statement that he has discovered a process of making a Port-

land cement, adapted to the building of homes, from cottages to palaces, which can be poured around iron or steel frames and made at a cost far cheaper than brick or stone, while being practically fire-proof, has already awakened an almost world-wide interest. This new building concrete, according to the inventor, is composed of crushed stone, sand, and cement. The houses will be poured into wooden shells temporarily put up around a skeleton framework. When the first story has been thus poured, the next will be treated in a similar manner. The roof and stairways also will be of cement. The pouring will require no special skill on the part of the laborers. The building will occupy comparatively few days, while the general effect can be made most pleasing to the artistic taste, as all who have visited the great expositions and world's fairs of recent years will readily understand. Mr. Edison believes that with this new concrete beautiful homes will be so cheapened that a poor man will be able to enjoy a little palace at a rental not exceeding ten dollars a month.

III. CHEAP AND LIGHT STORAGE BATTERIES.

The other discovery also promises great things, being something that inventors have laboriously toiled for during recent years. It is a new storage battery, which, among other advantages, is light and cheap in comparison with the lead batteries now in use, which weigh from 120 to 180 pounds per horsepower. Mr. Edison's new battery weighs 55 pounds per horsepower, and is thus seventy pounds lighter than the lightest lead batteries. One charge of a lead battery will carry about thirty miles, while the inventor claims that one charge of his new invention will carry from seventy-five to one hundred miles. Moreover, the old batteries take from four to five hours to charge, while the new batteries can be charged in from two to two and one-half hours. They are also easy to manage and not apt to get out of order. Few people realize the immense importance of a discovery that furnishes a high storage battery at a moderate cost. It will doubtless soon lead to the extensive employment of horseless vehicles in agricultural pursuits as well as greatly increase the use of automobiles and various self-propelling vehicles for travel and transportation, while its influence on the larger problems that relate to electrical power in manufacturing, lighting, and transportation will be incalculable.

IV. GENERATING POWER DIRECT FROM THE SUN.

Perhaps, however, the inventive discovery of the greatest promise that the present year has witnessed is that by which the great problem of generating power directly from the sun has been solved in a practical manner. No invention of recent years promises more in beneficent results for mankind than the solar motor, whose practicability at last has been proved in South Pasadena, California, where for many months it has been daily generating steam by which a ten horse-power engine raises water for irrigation purposes.

If we except aerial navigation, perhaps no problem has engaged inventors in recent years more than that of generating power by direct methods that would save the enormous expense heretofore required. The world's greatest waterfalls have been recently employed on a gigantic scale, and attempts are being made from time to time looking toward compelling the ocean's tides and waves to assist in solving this great twentieth-century problem. And now, through the agency of unique and ingenious machinery, employing gigantic reflectors, the necessary heat has been caught direct from the sun and transmitted to a boiler that develops a pressure of 150 pounds within one hour from the time the sun's rays begin to fall upon the mirrors. The reflector is fitted with an electric clock, by which it is moved three times every minute throughout the day, and in this manner it is made to follow the sun. The boiler is also so constructed that it turns with the reflector.

This invention is of course yet in its infancy, but it has passed the experimental stage, having, as has been observed, been in practical and satisfactory operation for many months. Its utility for the purposes of irrigation alone will be almost incalculable, as vast tracts of land that heretofore have been desert wastes, owing to the lack of water and the great expense for fuel essential to render irrigation possible, can now be transformed into gardens, orchards, and fruitful plains, and after the first cost there will be little additional outlay. As storage batteries become more and more perfected these motors will doubtless further serve man in important ways. The world is rapidly coming to a point where, with just and equitable social conditions, all men, women, and children can live in comfort and happiness, having an abundance of all that is needful and ample time for moral and intellectual culture and development and for recreation and rest.

V. MAKING SUN, WIND, AND WAVE THE SERVANTS OF MAN.

It is quite reasonable to expect that the world will soon see the sun utilized on a gigantic scale for the generation of power, while it is highly probable that improved machinery, somewhat similar to that foreshadowed by Professor George Sutherland in his admirable work on "Twentieth Century Inventions," will be utilized for making the wind and waves cheap and effective generators for the world's power. Along this line—that of generating power direct from the sun, winds, waves, and waterfalls—it seems that man's greatest progress will be made in the domain of invention and discovery of a utilitarian character; and these discoveries, if employed for the benefit of all people instead of for the enrichment of a few and the enslavement of the many, will go far toward enabling man to do the world's work in a few hours daily, leaving ample time for every son and daughter of earth to develop body, brain, and soul, and to enjoy the life that now is.

VI. SHALL SCIENCE AND INVENTION EMANCIPATE OR ENSLAVE EARTH'S MILLIONS?

But let no man forget that all the great potential blessings of life may be so abused that they fail to contribute to the happiness, elevation, and enrichment of life for all the people. It is for the men and women of to-day to determine, by their actions, their words, and their votes, whether the blessings of science, discovery, and inventive genius shall be made the beneficent servants of true progress, the emancipators of humanity, and the angels of peace, joy, and growth for earth's millions, or a blight to civilization and a further enslaver of the people. No man can escape the stupendous responsibility that to-day confronts him in the battle between democracy and commercial feudalism.

* * *

MR. JOHNSON AND THE TAX-DODGING CORPORATIONS.

One of the most important problems immediately confronting the electorate is that dealing with just and equitable taxation. For many years the farmers, small traders, and well-

to-do artisans have been paying taxes approximating the full demands of the law. The great wealthy railroads and other corporations have been, in a large proportion of cases, dishonestly evading the payment of a large percentage of their share of the taxes, and thus the poor and the middle class have been saddled with a load that has become an oppressive burden—a burden that would have been greatly lightened had the corporations borne their share in the government, State, and municipal expenses. Moreover, the presence of such dishonesty has necessarily served steadily to lower the *morale* of the people and to deaden the public conscience, while aiding in the establishment of an oppressive commercial feudalistic power—a parvenu plutocracy within the borders of the Republic.

From time to time there have been sporadic attacks on this growing injustice, which, thanks to an indifferent press and to the power of the corporations, the political boss, and the party machine, have amounted to little. Since the election of Mr. Tom L. Johnson to the office of mayor of Cleveland, however, the corporations have received a rude shock, as the aggressive Single-tax Democrat has boldly, bravely, and ably assailed this wrong in a manner that has greatly alarmed the corrupt monopolies. The mayor is making a systematic effort to compel the railroads and other rich corporations that operate natural monopolies to pay a just proportion of the taxes. Something of the method as well as the aggressive spirit of this statesman may be gleaned from the following, which recently appeared in *The Public* and was taken from a private letter written by the mayor of Cleveland to Mr. Post:

"I have employed Prof. E. W. Bemis, and we have been making a campaign against the present assessment of steam-railroad property for taxation. Eighteen or twenty of the railroad assessing boards have met in Cleveland, and we have been able to show in each case that the railroad property was assessed at from five to fifteen per cent. of its true value in money, averaging very much below ten per cent. when considered all together. These local boards have made only slight increases in assessments as a result of our appearing before them, and we propose to carry a protest to Columbus before a board of equalization composed of four State officers who have the power to increase these assessments without limitation. We may fail there also, but we are arousing this entire State on the subject, and the question appeals to the rural districts more strongly than was anticipated. Our aim is to make this the principal issue at the election of members of the Legislature next fall. Should we succeed in doing that, I predict a revolution in the conservative country vote. We purpose showing that more than \$500,000,000 of steam-railroad property escapes taxation through the ig-

norance or cupidity of the auditors in the eighty-eight counties. We will also show how much each county loses by the present unjust plan. There isn't a county in this State that is not affected, and the distinctively farming counties are the heaviest losers. From the responses I have received from all classes of citizens in this State, I feel that we have touched a sympathetic chord, and I look for great results for just taxation."

The splendid fight that Mr. Johnson is making will command the enthusiastic approval of every honest citizen, while it is sure to arouse against him all the power that plutocracy can command. Of course, his motives will be impugned by the corruptors and by the corrupted who have become wealthy by means of indirection. The army of crumb-seekers in press, pulpit, college, and State—that, Uriah Heap-like, humbly do the bidding of the trust magnates and of the capitalistic exploiters—will leave no stone unturned in their effort to discredit and make ineffective the vitally important work being carried forward by one of the bravest and ablest men in public or private life to-day. These things are to be expected, but they should be met by the united, passionate, and whole-souled support of every man and woman who loves democracy and who believes in honesty, justice, and an equality of opportunity.

* * *

PLUTOCRACY'S BELSHAZZAR-LIKE ARROGANCE.

The charges of thoughtful writers, statesmen, and educators, who, seeing the corrupting influence of plutocracy throughout the social and political organisms, have raised a warning voice, have recently been emphasized and reenforced from a most unexpected quarter. The trusts and corporations must indeed be very confident when a paper like the *New York Sun* throws away all disguise and makes the following frank editorial confession:

"War upon plutocracy is hopeless. The Democracy will never prevail until it satisfies the country that the Democrats, not the Republican party, are the real friends and instruments of plutocracy. They must offer more favorable conditions for money-making than the Republicans can furnish, or they will remain indefinitely as poor in political strength as they are to-day."

The *New York Sun*, says Mr. Louis F. Post, editor of *The*

Public, "is said to be under the control of J. Pierpont Morgan;" but, whether this is true or not, there can be no question as to the fact that the *Sun* is one of the strongest and ablest outspoken supporters of the present Administration as well as an efficient friend of monopoly and the centralizing of wealth and power in the hands of the few. This astounding confession is even less significant, however, than the action of certain great corporations which have heretofore been deferent to labor organizations, but which now boldly declare that they will henceforth under no circumstances recognize organized labor. It is quite evident that at last the representatives of predatory wealth believe themselves to be sufficiently intrenched behind the bulwarks of government, and that their control over opinion-forming agencies is also such, that they can safely throw off all masks and arrogantly exercise despotic power with impunity. We believe, however, that the exercise of this spirit, as much as anything else, will awaken the people and set in motion reactionary influences that not unlikely will precipitate a crisis. Certain it is that the war upon the labor unions will add thousands of recruits to the ranks of the Socialists.

BOOKS OF THE DAY.

REVIEWED BY B. O. FLOWER.*

EMILE ZOLA'S SOCIAL MASTERPIECE.

LABOR. A novel by Emile Zola. Cloth, 604 pp. Price, \$1.50. New York: Harper Brothers.

A Book Study.

I.

Nothing is more instructive or suggestive to the student of literature who is deeply interested in economic progress than the great number of "social visions" by leading thinkers and popular writers that have appeared within the last quarter of a century, and the marked success that has attended many of them. Edward Bellamy's "Looking Backward" was a pioneer work. It had been refused by one leading firm, and was finally brought out by Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin & Company. To the amazement of the publishers, it inaugurated the day of enormous single-volume sales, more than a quarter of a million copies being greedily taken by the public, whose indefinable longings were already reaching toward a higher ethical spirit in government—toward a social state in which coöperation should be the key-note, and justice, freedom, and fraternity the dominant influences in society.

The next "social vision" to obtain wide currency was William Morris's "News from Nowhere." The distinguished and popular poet, artist, and novelist had come under the compelling influence of the new spirit of the age, and henceforth he dedicated his life to the service of all. "News from Nowhere," though in many ways not as satisfactory as many similar works that have since appeared, possesses real literary merit and will long live in our literature. It is also rich in helpful suggestions and breathes forth that spirit of freedom which the great Socialistic leaders of the Anglo-Saxon world hold will never be realized until civilization comes under the beneficent influence of the coöperative commonwealth.

Joquin Miller's "City Beautiful" was unfortunate in its publishers, and therefore was never brought extensively before the reading public. It, however, is in many respects the most charming of all the "social visions" of our time—a literary gem, highly poetic and freighted with

* Books intended for review in THE ARENA should be addressed to B. O. Flower, 5 Park Square, Boston, Mass.

the finest thought of the new time. It also shows how intimate is the relationship between the life and teachings of Jesus and the present-day ideals of coöperation, of justice, of liberty, and of fraternity, which constitute the burden of the message of the prophets of social progress. It contains an ideal picture, sketched by a consummate artist and poet, whose work embodies very much of the splendid vision of the new time that is coming into the consciousness of many throughout the civilized world.

Then came Mr. Blatchford's "Merrie England," a book that in many respects suggests "News from Nowhere," and written down to the comprehension of the simplest intelligence. It is said that between one and two million copies of this book have been sold.

Perhaps the most finished of all the "social visions" of the present time is Mr. Howells's "A Traveler from Altruria," a noble literary and artistic addition to the permanent social fiction of America; but the most masterly economic exposition of the new Socialism in the form of a romance that the New World has given to mankind is found in Edward Bellamy's last great economic romance, "Equality," a volume which occupied the closing years of the author's life and in which the principal objections advanced against Socialism are one by one answered in the course of the story and in a spirit at once free, frank, tolerant, and engaging. But, like many of the social romances dominated largely by the message of justice, the novel or story as such is too insignificant to interest those whose chief desire is to be entertained.

Before me, however, lies a social romance that will hold the attention of thoughtful people by its profound human interest and its vivid dramatic pictures of life quite as much as by the powerful contrasting views of warring social systems that occupy the thought of civilization to-day. This most recent and in many respects strongest story that recent decades have contributed to the literature of coöperation and Socialism is "Labor," Emile Zola's latest novel. *No student of social, economic, or political conditions, and indeed no person who wishes to keep abreast of the current of modern life as it relates to economic progress, can afford to slight this masterpiece among social studies—this epic of labor and love.*

II.

The story abounds in striking antitheses. The Pit is the incarnation of the modern capitalistic iron works, with their long hours and dehumanizing influences, thrown up in striking lines upon the canvas. It is not an exaggerated picture, as those familiar with the great iron works will attest. Here we see the war of the workers against the manager, who, himself a hard-working man, is striving to earn large dividends on the investment for the capitalist who has furnished the money. Starvation and deep-seated hatred are much in evidence, and the sodden, brutalized puddlers, half burned up by the frightful heat to which they are subjected through long days of toil, are drawn with such photographic accuracy that the reader sees and feels what the author must

have seen and felt before it would have been possible for him to have penned this powerful protest against the old order. While over against this gloomy scene, typical of the present-day struggle between the capitalist class and the proletariat, Zola places the ideal city of brotherhood and the agrarian communal community—La Crecherie and Combettes, where under an equality of opportunity there arises a new order—such an order as would exist under conditions of justice and fraternity and that will be realized in the oncoming age, unless the onward sweep of life toward coöperation for all receives a serious check on the one hand or succumbs to the despotism of commercial feudalism on the other.

III.

The novel opens with M. Luc Froment's arrival in the iron-manufacturing community where an enormous industry has been builded up by two generations of hard-working men—the Qurignons, father and son. The latter, after establishing the business on a gigantic scale, realizing a munificent fortune and building for himself, and as he fondly hopes for the generations of Qurignons who are to come after him, a lordly palace, becomes paralyzed. That was thirty years before the story opens, and though he still lives and is daily wheeled throughout the broad domain over which he had long wielded the authority of owner, he has not during this entire period been able to frame a word, and his wistful eyes gaze out upon the world without expression or aught to indicate that the changing scenes before him are noted or their meaning understood.

The works have for long years been carried on through the capital of his granddaughter and her husband, Boisgelin, and under the able, energetic, and industrious management of one Delaveau, a cousin of Boisgelin's. The immediate family of M. Jerome Qurignon, the invalid, had turned out badly. Insanity, dissipation, and violent death had taken from him all save his beautiful and high-minded granddaughter, Suzanne, who, with her husband Boisgelin and their little son Paul, resides at Guerdache. The enormous revenue yielded by the Pit and turned over to Boisgelin is largely blood money, having been wrung from the workers by compelling them to labor during long hours in the most exhausting toil and under unsanitary and unhealthy conditions, for wages that only permit them to live in hovels of poverty and amid conditions that favor moral degeneration, mental inertia, and physical decay.

Delaveau, the manager of the foundries, typifies the modern money-seeker, who toils long and laboriously in an effort to create wealth and who becomes infected by the fatal spirit of modern materialistic commercialism, while Boisgelin represents another class. He is a man upon whom wealth has fallen as a curse, anesthetizing his conscience and taking from him those finer qualities which lift man to a noble eminence and which largely differentiate him from the lower animals. This man, like the other leading figures in the story, is colossal because he is truly typical. He lives in a false world, having a contempt for labor and sub-

ordinating all thought and aim in life to the gratification of selfish and sensual desires. He is false to his wife, by whom he has acquired wealth; false to the manager of his works, who is supplying him with a princely revenue by which he is enabled to pursue his career of unbridled lust and extravagance; and he is false to almost every duty and responsibility that manhood and circumstances in life impose upon the individual.

From the vivid pictures of misery, drunkenness, degradation, and brutality at the Pit, and of ease and luxury at Guerdache, the reader follows the hero of the volume to the home of M. Jordan. Here a brother and sister live in a quiet, simple way. The former is very delicate, but he is an indefatigable worker, a working scientist, engaged in electrical experiments. He is little interested in the social and economic conditions, believing that through scientific inventions and discoveries humanity is to be emancipated. He also has extensive iron works, but they have been carried on by a trusted agent who has just died, and it is to consult M. Luc Froment about the future of the works that Jordan and his sister, Soeurette, have called him from Paris. The brother wishes to sell the works to Delaveau, that he may not be annoyed, taxed, or worried with any outside enterprises; but Luc prevails on him to delay action until he has considered the matter. Later the hero of the romance proposes to run the works on a coöperative or Socialistic plan, believing he can set an example in a practical way, through the success of which other communities, and in time the entire nation, will be led to adopt a similar peaceable solution for the great world problem—a solution that rests on justice and equality of opportunity for all, whose key-note is brotherhood, and that would inevitably further the rise and permanent happiness of the many. The proposition of Luc is warmly seconded by the sister and is assented to by the brother. Thenceforth the progress of La Crecherie, as the new social iron-manufacturing community is called, and that of the Pit run parallel. Later the peasants of Combettes decide to come into the community of La Crecherie.

The struggles, the discouragements, the despair of the young philanthropist are vividly pictured, and one of the most dramatic pages of the book is that dealing with the advice of young Jordan to the discouraged Luc, in which the former insists that Luc must not give up his plan. At length the tide turns. La Crecherie and not the Pit becomes the great center of prosperity as it has long been of health and of a larger degree of happiness and comfort than workingmen have hitherto known. This, however, only serves to arouse the *bourgeois* population of the Pit, who unite in a savage attempt to crush the new experiment, first by law. Later Luc is stabbed by a would-be assassin. However, he does not die, and that which seemed to be a great calamity proves a blessing to the philanthropist, bringing to him love and loyalty.

The years pass, and the members of the coöperative community grow rapidly in wealth. They are concerned in the manufacture of iron implements for peace and progress, of agricultural implements and iron

for transportation and peaceful commerce; while the manager of the Pit, believing that implements of war will prove most remunerative, has long since given his attention to the making of guns and shells. The Pit, having no reserve fund, is unprepared for a time of depression, and a tragic end overtakes the faithless wife and the hard-working manager, both of whom perish in flames which consume the Pit and which have been lighted by the manager's hand.

Old Jerome Qurignon, now far into the eighties, after looking out on the world with expressionless vision for more than a generation, gives evidence of having received a powerful internal shock and of regaining the faculty of speech. This occurs just after the burning of the Pit. The first articulate words are, "It is necessary to give back." On the sign of an awakening consciousness on the part of her grandfather, Suzanne had sent for the old family physician, who, after an examination, expressed the conviction that it was probable that the old man had received an internal shock and that dissolution was at hand. Moreover, he continued, it was not improbable that before he died he would regain the power of speech. The physician then recounted some cases in which this phenomenon had appeared, and he further expressed the fear that the aged capitalist might have seen and understood all that had gone on for thirty years, as such cases were on record. A few days later the invalid regained the power of speech sufficiently to request the presence of M. Luc Froment, as well as that of Suzanne, Boisgelin, and the little Paul. He then recounted how the vast fortune accumulated had been a curse, because it had been unjustly acquired. What others had earned the Qurignons had appropriated, and this gold had in time come to blight and curse the family. His son Michael, after indulging in years of licentious dissipation, had ended his life with a pistol shot. His daughter Laure had taken the veil. His son Philippe had married a worthless character and later had been killed in a duel. His grandson Andre had wasted his life in an insane asylum, and Gustave, the brother of Suzanne, had robbed his father of mistress and fortune, leaving the latter to commit suicide, while he also met a violent death. Boisgelin, the husband of M. Jerome's only surviving granddaughter, had squandered their fortune on the wife of the manager of the Pit, had brought the great business to the verge of ruin, and was also the cause of the tragic death of Delaveau and the faithless Fernande as well as of the reduction of the Pit to ashes.

And now the hour has come when "restitution must be made." "Nothing," says the old man, speaking as one from the tomb, "of that which we have believed to be our wealth is ours. If this wealth has poisoned us and destroyed us, it is because it was the wealth of others. For our happiness and the happiness of others, it is necessary to give back." The old man appeals to each one present and insists that the splendid palace of Guerdache, which he had builded to be the proud home of the Qurignons for generations, as well as what remains of the Pit, must be returned to the people. The former shall be made into a hospital for women and children, with its spacious grounds for a public

park, while the Pit shall be revived and operated only under the Socialistic plan employed by Luc in the building up of the great La Crecherie.

M. Jerome Qurignon's wishes were carried out, and as the years passed the rich agricultural fields of Combettes and the great manufacturing interests of La Crecherie and the Pit were carried on for the mutual benefit of all. Great wealth came as the result of united labor, but instead of being enjoyed by the few while the many remained in poverty, squalor, and constant fear of the evil day to come, each family alike enjoyed opulence; and under just and equitable conditions in which all worked and none feared for the morrow life took on new meaning and beauty. The heart sang, the soul developed, the brain expanded. Joy reigned everywhere, and the spirit of love and fraternity dominated society.

IV.

"Labor," though unquestionably the most interesting as well as one of the strongest Socialistic novels yet written, is not free from defects, both as an ethical treatise and as literature. It is freer from the naturalism that has proved so offensive in most of Zola's great works; yet in the relations sustained for a time between the hero and Josine, a beautiful victim of the present-day unjust social order, we find a moral blot that takes from the value of the work. And, though M. Luc almost pays the penalty for his offense with his life, yet the episode detracts much from the value of a volume which as a whole is instinct with the full-orbed justice and the spirit of brotherhood that are streaking the eastern sky with the promise of the coming of a brighter day than man has ever known. One regrets finding any moral blot in a work whose spirit and dominating note are so essentially noble. It is only just to observe, however, that apparently the defect of the work arises from the author's desire to protest against the degrading influence of present-day social conditions and conventional ethical standards rather than from a confused view of the fundamentals of right and wrong in social relations.

From a literary point of view the volume is rather prolix and is I think materially weakened by the long-drawn-out chapters which follow the dramatic recital of M. Jerome Qurignon; for here, after a powerful dramatic climax, the author's intense desire to force home on the imagination of his readers the happiness and growth that will attend the inauguration of a social system based on justice and brotherhood, leads him to dwell at length upon the various marriages of the little ones he has beautifully and touchingly depicted in earlier chapters; and, apparently fascinated by the picture of a free, emancipated, and happy people, M. Zola dwells long and lovingly on his theme; whereas, had he closed the book with a brief descriptive epilogue, showing the turning over of Guerdache and the Pit to La Crecherie, where in a few compact sentences a picture of the joy of life under love, justice, and brotherhood should have been boldly outlined, the novel would have been immensely strengthened.

Typographically the book is far from being up to the old standard

of the Harpers. We find such examples of careless proof-reading as the following: "She heaved a great *sight*" (for "*sigh*"). The word "sufused" occurs for "diffused." "Andre" occurs where it should read "Achille." Such mistakes are indeed surprising in a book bearing the imprint of Messrs. Harper Brothers.

V.

As a story, "Labor" is intensely entertaining, being filled with the human interest, the graphic descriptions, and the faithful portrayals for which M. Zola is justly famed; while its comparative freedom from objectionable naturalism makes it an acceptable volume for general perusal. That a book so instinct with justice, moral vitality, and ethical power should offend conventional critics and the upholders of social injustice goes without saying. Already the criticisms against "Labor" remind one of the attacks and ridicule heaped upon Victor Hugo's noble masterpiece, "Les Misérables," by the popular but morally servile critics of a generation ago who upheld ancient thought and defended the old order. The dilettante "sissies" who occupy seats of honor on literary journals that are pledged to the defense of the *bourgeois* civilization are always ready to cry down virile works that make for social righteousness or that call loudly to the conscience in the name of justice. But in literature as in life it is the prophet voice sounding in the van of the caravan of civilization that helps the world onward and that lives in the love of the ages. "Labor" will do an immense service through the power of suggestion, coming as it does at a time when the social conscience is awakening and in an expectant attitude. The vision of full-orbed development, of freedom and happiness, and of the inevitable result that must follow the reign of justice and fraternity in the social state, will live in the imagination of thousands who in time will become prophets, apostles, and teachers of the higher moral concepts that are floating upon the horizon of the twentieth century. My advice to all friends of THE ARENA is to read "Labor." It will do you good.

THE MASTER-KNOT OF HUMAN FATE. By Ellis Meredith.

Cloth, 310 pp. Price, \$1.25. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

This romance is as stimulating and suggestive as it is unique in its character. A catastrophe engulfs all North America save a tract in the Rocky Mountains, on which are but two human survivors, a man and a woman, after the cataclysm. The man is a brilliant young lawyer who was rapidly rising in the public world. The woman is somewhat older than her companion. She is a person of great strength of character and much individuality, possessing a wonderful singing voice. A cabin on the mountain-side affords shelter and home. There are some cattle, horses, and other domestic animals that were above the water line when the ocean swept over the plains and plateaus. For days, weeks, and

months the two keep a beacon-fire burning on the mountain-side, but look in vain for sail or smoke-stack. During these waiting months, and even after they have given up all hope of rescue, the time is largely spent in gardening, exploring their world, and caring for the animals left in their charge; and during this time they discussed many vital problems that intimately relate to civilization here and now. In referring to the condition of our country at the time of the cataclysm, the heroine says:

"Given a pure democracy, and *demos* reigns sooner or later. The shiftless go to the bottom, and then, like the upper and nether mill-stones, they grind everything between them. That which is below cries 'Alms!' and that which is above responds, 'Largesse,' and the voice that cries 'Justice!' is stifled between. The stone that crushed from above and the rock that ground from below were very near, and men dreaded them, for when the grist is ground, and flint strikes upon flint, the conflagration is at hand. . . . I only know what I saw, and what the poets have said. I wouldn't dare to be as radical as Lowell, nor as bitter as Tennyson, nor as savage as Carlyle, or Ruskin, or Hugo. We had overcome the sharpness of death, but whence could we hope for deliverance from the sharpness of living?"

Perhaps some readers will think there is a touch of morbidity in the closing chapters, where the survivors of a world's wreck, who have come to love, gravely debate whether they shall cast themselves over the beetling crags into the sea and drown together or emulate our first parents. Yet for some this discussion will doubtless prove as interesting and suggestive as the many other thoughtful arguments that enter into the romance. The story is deeply interesting from its opening page. It is finished in literary form and possesses a charming simplicity of style, while a high moral purpose is everywhere in evidence.

THE MORISCOS IN SPAIN: THEIR CONVERSION AND EXPULSION. By Henry Charles Lea, LL.D. Cloth, 463 pp. Philadelphia: Lea Brothers & Company.

This volume is a valuable contribution to authoritative historical literature. It is the work of one of the most careful and painstaking modern students of history—a scholar who in his former able contributions has shown the capacity and inclination for that exhaustive research which is necessary for the writer who essays to deal with subject-matter at its fountain-head, and who must not only sift evidence but also arrange and marshal before the reader such facts as are germane to the subject and of whose authenticity there is little reasonable doubt. Dr. Lea's scholarly and voluminous works on "The History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages," and "The History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church," as well as his five other historical works on kindred subjects, amply demonstrate his worth as an able and fearless historian to whose indefatigable labors the Protestant world is greatly indebted.

The present volume concerns one of the most somber but interesting pages of medieval history, embodying not only, as the author observes, "a tragedy commanding the deepest sympathy, but it epitomizes nearly all the errors and tendencies which combined to cast down Spain in little more than a century from its splendor under Charles V. to its humiliation under Carlos II." This deeply fascinating subject is treated in a clear, forcible, and engaging manner. The reader's attention is quickly caught and sustained throughout the work in a way that proves the historian to be a master in his craft. It is well that we have a brave, painstaking, and candid historian to give a truthful, unvarnished story of the crimes committed in the name of religion in the past; for no lesson is more timely for Americans than that which impresses the importance of maintaining, guarding, and protecting perfect religious freedom for every child of earth and the necessity of combating all attempts to mix religion with politics or to unite Church and State. There can be no great or permanent growth or enduring happiness where toleration and intellectual and religious freedom are not cherished and encouraged.

THE WOMAN WHO TRUSTED. By Will N. Harben. Cloth, 258 pp. Price, \$1.50. Philadelphia: Henry Altemus Company.

In this novel we have the story of a young Southern author who, after winning the heart of a beautiful young woman in his native town, goes to New York in quest of fame and fortune. He is soon disillusioned, as have been hundreds of other aspiring authors. Poverty and misfortune companion him. A designing widow lends him money at a time when his father through speculation is on the brink of ruin and disgrace. In return for the timely generosity the young man in a moment of emotional weakness offers to marry his benefactress. He is immediately accepted, and at a time when the young lady from the South, with whom he is really in love, is *en route* to New York to perfect her musical education. Complications follow, but in the end the Southern belle triumphs and the story closes happily. This story, which originally appeared serially in *The Saturday Evening Post*, is by no means, in our judgment, equal to some other work that Mr. Harben has given to the public. The hero is not a strong character, nor are the other personages in this book instinct with life.

NEW MODES OF THOUGHT. By C. T. Stockwell. Cloth, 150 pp. Price, \$1. Boston: James H. West Company.

In "New Modes of Thought," by Mr. C. T. Stockwell, we have one of the ablest and most thought-stimulating works that have appeared in months. The author possesses the happy faculty of presenting his thought in a compact, entertaining, and easily comprehensible manner. The volume is chiefly devoted to the discussion of "The New Materialism" and "The New Pantheism." Under these two general heads Mr.

Stockwell considers: "Movement of Philosophic Theories;" "Spencer's Philosophy;" "Haeckel's Monism;" "What of the Future—the Trend?" "A Conscious Universe;" "A Completed Chapter in the Atomic Theory;" "Spanning the Chasm;" "The Matterhorn of Modern Scientific Speculation;" "New Modes of Thought Inevitable;" "Old and New Pantheism—How Related;" "Development of the Pantheistic Conception;" "The Instinct of Personification;" "Coalescence of Theism and Pantheism Possible;" "Origin of Isms;" "Defining God;" "The Ultimate Productive Cause;" and "Begotten, not Created." As to the value of this work I cannot do better than quote the thoughtful opinion of the editor of the *Springfield Republican*, who observes that:

"Here we have presented, in the most concise and comprehensive shape, what has not hitherto come into print: the momentous trend of chemistry, physics, and philosophy to one and the same end—the recognition of a point where matter (as understood) stops, and something comes in which even great scientific scholars declare may as well be termed 'Love' as be given any other name. This is the same as saying that scientific reasoning has touched upon spiritual force, and has recognized it."

THE SYMPHONY OF LIFE. A Series of Constructive Sketches and Interpretations. By Henry Wood. Cloth, gilt top, 203 pp. Price, \$1.25. Boston: Lee & Shepard.

Mr. Henry Wood has wrought a work of great value in giving our people a number of metaphysical and New Thought works, both in essay and story form, which are essentially noble, inspiring, and refining in character and influence. His glowing style lends a charm to whatever he writes, and, though I cannot agree with many of his social and economic views, I have derived great pleasure and profit from his lofty philosophic idealism, as found in "The Symphony of Life," "God's Image in Man," "Ideal Suggestion," "Studies in the Thought World," and his two novels, "Edward Burton" and "Victor Serenus." I know of no modern essayist who has the power of investing abstract philosophic theories with such fascinating interest as Mr. Wood. What in the hands of most writers is dry and difficult to comprehend is presented by this essayist in so luminous a manner as to be at once clear and entertaining.

Mr. Wood's latest work, "The Symphony of Life," merits wide reading. It is a handsome volume, containing twenty-three essays, in which such subjects as the following are thoughtfully and entertainingly presented: "From the Pre-Adamic to the Human;" "The Human Body as a Temple;" "The Oneness of Life and Being;" "Evolutionary Reconciliation;" "What is the Meaning of Evil?" "What is the Higher Law?" "Thinking as a Fine Art;" "The Ever Present Judgment;" "The Unfulfilled Ideal of Religious Liberalism;" "Reactions in the Higher Development;" "Dogmatism, New and Old;" and "The Cosmic Consciousness."

THE LIFE AND LITERATURE OF THE ANCIENT HEBREWS.

By the Rev. Lyman Abbott, D.D. Price, \$2.00. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Company.

Reviewed by the Rev. Robert E. Bisbee.

The Rev. Lyman Abbott, D.D., has had so much to say on so many questions—he is so steadfast in adherence to theories once accepted, so dogmatic in assertion and strenuous in opinion—that, able and apparently candid writer that he is, his utterances awaken in thoughtful minds an *a priori* sense of distrust. For this reason I wish that some other author, with a style of equal force, clearness, and beauty, might have given us the book which claims to place before the reader the best results of the higher criticism of the Old Testament—to contain a careful analysis of the law, politics, poetry, history, drama, philosophy, ethical culture, theology, folk-lore, and fiction of the ancient Hebrew people. This is a great claim, and it is unfortunate that it could not come from one capable of commanding a higher confidence in the accuracy of his mental processes. Even from the hand of Dr. Abbott the book is not without worth. It is, of course, intensely interesting. It contains a strong and novel putting of many vexed problems in Scriptural interpretation, and, if I were sure that the author was not exalting certain facts and suppressing others in the interest of preconceived theories, I would add that the book is a storehouse of valuable information. Under the circumstances, however, I would scarcely dare to do this without verifying by original investigation the statements of the celebrated and eloquent divine.

The work contains four hundred pages and is divided into sixteen chapters. It discusses the Bible as literature, Hebrew history, prehistoric traditions, the life of Moses, the founding of the Israelitish nation, Hebrew ethical philosophy, Bible lyrics, the nature of prophecy, and the message of Israel. In the course of the discussion, mingled with much that is wise and helpful, are occasional lapses into such consummate illogicalness as this: "The government of the father does not depend on the consent of the children, nor that of the teacher on the consent of the pupil, nor that of God on the consent of man. No more does the government of the State depend on the consent of the citizens. For America the notion that government rests on the consent of the governed was forever demolished by the civil war." He then goes on to show that government rests on divine authority.

The error in the foregoing is very subtle and almost defies analysis. There is a deceitful equivocal meaning in one of the terms. Government, in the deeper sense of eternal law, may not depend on the consent of the governed, but the form and scope of national governments do; and this notion has never been demolished, nor indeed can it be. It may be defeated for a time; it may be obscured, juggled with by such men as Abbott, but demolished never. The words above quoted contain the entire reversal of history and render utterly obsolete Lincoln's Gettysburg ora-

tion. They degrade the founders of the government, together with its great savior, from the rank of statesmanship to that of blind leaders of the blind. They imply a false analogy between parental, school, and divine government on the one hand and the forms of national government on the other. Even taking the term *government* in its deeper significance of eternal law, the author's position is not wholly true; for it is not the authority or dictum of even the supreme Lawgiver that gives force to law so much as it is the eternal constitution of things, whether revealed and declared or not. Moreover, it is not necessarily quite true that the consent of man may not be in some sense a factor in this eternal constitution. Dr. Abbott has herein revealed himself as at times a shallow thinker, a sophist, and an unsafe leader.

A statement, nearer to the truth than anything Dr. Abbott is capable of, has been made by Professor James T. Bixby. He says: "The distinction between sin and righteousness is not made by any fiat, even of the Almighty. The reason that injustice is wrong is not because it is forbidden by divine edicts but is wrong whether forbidden or not. . . . The law of right is as independent of authority, human or celestial, as it is everlasting." To the same effect Bishop Brewster of Connecticut has beautifully said: "The moral has its seat not in the will of God but in the being of God." Abbott, on the other hand, insists on the "authority" of God as the source of law, and lapses into such loose statements as that "the seat of law is the bosom of Almighty God; it is the authority of the one and only lawgiver."

Such utterances have been the refuge of the quacks and the false prophets of all ages. A recent illustration is that of John Alexander Dowie declaring himself to be the third Elijah and demanding tithes of all his followers in the name of the God of Israel. Dr. Abbott does not, of course, intend to reenforce such fanaticism. We are not criticizing his purpose, but his method of treating deep and vital truths.

With the book as a whole, however, we see little reason to disagree. In the main it accords with the latest and most rational and sensible explanations of the nature and origin of the Bible. In fact, very much of the subject-matter is too obvious, too common, to demand publication at this late day. The best parts of the book are in no sense original except in the putting. As a master of style Dr. Abbott is great. He is a rhetorician, but not a profound scholar, an original thinker, or a safe logician.

ROBERT E. BISBEE.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

"Were You Born Under a Lucky Star?" By A. Alphus. Cloth, 217 pp. Chicago and New York: Hennebury Company.

"Logic." By George H. Smith. Cloth, 266 pp. Price, \$1.25 net. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

"Love in a Mist." Poems. By Post Wheeler. Cloth, \$1.25. New York: The Camelot Company.

"From Sunlight to Shade." By Grenville Atkins. Cloth, 75 pp. Chicago: The Neely Company.

"Iturbide, a Soldier of Mexico." A romance. By John Lewin McLeish, A.M., M.D. Cloth, illustrated, 166 pp. Price, \$1.50. New York: The Abbey Press.

"A B C of the Telephone." By James E. Homans. Cloth, illustrated, indexed, 332 pp. New York: Theo. Audel & Company.

"Politics of the Nazarene: What Jesus Said to Do." By O. D. Jones. Paper, 288 pp. Price, 50 cents. Edina, Mo.: O. D. Jones.

"Lisbeth: A Story of Two Worlds." By Carrie E. S. Twing. Cloth, stamped in gold, 354 pp. Boston: Banner of Light Publishing Company.

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.

IN its pointed and vigorous criticism of the theological vagaries of the day, the lecture by Prof. George D. Herron to which we give first place in this month's ARENA is in perfect alignment with the reformatory policy of this magazine. It will be noted that Dr. Herron makes no attack upon the ideal *religion* that was taught and practised by Jesus and his immediate followers: on the contrary, he takes pains to express his profound regard for its Founder, its principles and precepts, and its practical utility when woven into the fabric of human life and society. It is the ecclesiastical superstructure, based upon the pride, greed, and selfishness of the institution-builders of later centuries, that he assails—the fear-begotten mental slavery that has resulted from the degrading lust of men for power and authority. In Dr. Herron's advocacy of a return to primitive religious ideals—that communism of Truth without which even economic justice is impossible—he has the silent sympathy of multitudes who are repelled by the prevailing commercial traffic in “salvation;” and evidences are not wanting of the early emergence of an increased number of such outspoken reformers from the modern pulpit into the light of the new day.

Editor Patterson will contribute to our next issue an article on “The Spirit of Modern Christianity,” which will present other phases of the condition wrought by the materialistic theology by which the instinctive religious impulses of the human heart have been seared. It will show the appalling extent to which the teachings of the Nazarene have been nullified by the crystallized officialism of the Church, and will tend to call a halt in our radical departure from the moral and ethical

standards that were the true glory of the Christianity of Christ.

The leading feature of our October number will be an address by the Hon. Wayne MacVeagh, LL.D., on "The Value of Ethical Ideals in American Politics," which was recently delivered before the Society of the Phi Beta Kappa of Harvard University. It has been carefully revised by the author and will attract universal attention, for it is an exceedingly timely and important contribution to the discussion of our political concepts.

Academic freedom is a burning question in the development of education in America, and it is one that will persist till the war against monopoly of all kinds has been fought to a finish. Despite the labored attempts of intrenched wealth to prove that university instruction in this country is unhampered by the opinions and prejudices of college founders, the fact remains that conscientious teachers are being coerced and their chairs declared vacant by the trustees of many of our institutions of learning. No one can doubt this, or remain ignorant of the tendency to curtail liberty of thought in the United States, who reads Prof. Thomas E. Will's paper in this issue on "The College Trust." The array of facts presented is unanswerable; yet their most discouraging aspect is not the forced resignations of teachers of independent views and principles recounted by the author, but rather the indorsement of this arbitrary policy by a subsidized press.

In Prof. Frank Parsons's illustrated review of the progress of democratic ideals during the last century in the current number, an antidote will be found to any pessimistic reflections that may result from Prof. Will's marshaling of the handicaps on educational freedom. This third article of the most valuable series that *THE ARENA* has ever published is a condensed history in which no fact is abridged. The author's deductions are always luminous, and are worthy of careful study. His

subject for the October number relates to the industrial progress of the century.

Our symposium this month on the late James A. Herne is a merited appreciation of an actor whose services in the interests of a more worthy dramatic literature will have far-reaching effects. He was not a mere impersonator of character, but a student, a philosopher, a social reformer—a man interested in the progress and prosperity of his race. This feature is followed by an article from the pen of W. A. Hawley that Mr. Herne would have loved to read—"The Single Tax as a Happy Medium"—for the famous actor and playwright was a profound admirer of the late Henry George and his economic teachings.

An important symposium on "The Single Tax and the Trust" is in preparation for our next issue. Among the contributors to this discussion will be Louis F. Post, editor of the *Chicago Public*; J. H. Ralston, Esq., of Washington, D. C.; and Mr. Bolton Hall, of New York—three leading and thoroughly representative advocates of a principle of taxation in which an increasing number of social reformers are beginning to discern a solvent of our political, industrial, and economic ills.

J. E. M.

His study
deductions
beams
valued
lives
ions